

THE
Novelty and Nullity
OF ^{855. f. 11}
Dissatisfaction:

OR,
The Solemn Affirmation
D E F E N D E D,

Against the Unwarrantable Attempts
of a *Nameless* Author,
In a Late *Essay* upon *Mat. 5. 33, - 37.*

WHEREIN

His Erroneous Exposition of the Text, Confused
Notion of an Oath, many Precarious Assertions,
Repeated Contradictions, False or Fallacious
Reasonings, and Palpable Misrepresentations
of our Ancient Friends, &c. are Manifested.

By RICHARD CLARIDGE.

Truth, and not Vain-glory, is the thing we Contend for, *Min. Felix.* p. 13. Edit. Oxon. 1662.

Lay down all Affection and Favour of Parties: Judge Justly of
that *which* shall be Alledged. Unless thou Knowest, thou
canst not Judge: Unless thou Hearest both sides, thou canst
not Know. *JEWEL's Defence of the Apology*, Pref. p. ult.

L O N D O N:

Printed and Sold by *Philip Gwillim* in *Austin-Fryars*,
near the *Royal Exchange*, 1714.

Preface to the Reader.

I Cannot but think it a great Unhappiness
to Us as a Society, that a Dissatisfaction
should arise among any of our Pro-
fession, with respect to the Declaration of
Fidelity, and the solemn Affirmation, which
God in his great Mercy hath imposed the
Legislature to grant us instead of the Usual
Oaths; and that those among us, who are
well satisfied therewith, from the Ser-
vices of Truth, and the Conscience of
ministers of our shared Faith, should be
obliged, in their own just Defence, to have
Recourse to Pen to Answer them.
Tis so long ago as the Year 1733
that a Book, intitled, A Position and I
firmness against all swearing, &c. was Print-
ed and Dispersed among Friends, again-
Using such Form of Speech, as are in
the Declaration of Fidelity and solemn Af-
firmation, in Terms or Wordly Mat-
ter which was soon after followed with

T H E

Preface to the Reader.

I Cannot but think it a great *Unhappiness* to Us as a *Society*, that a *Dissatisfaction* should arise among any of our *Profession*, with respect to the *Declaration of Fidelity*, and the *Solemn Affirmation*, which God in his great Mercy hath inclined the *Legislature* to grant us, instead of the *Usual Oaths*; and that those among us, who are *well Satisfied* therewith, from the *Scriptures of Truth*, and the *Concurrent Testimonies* of our *Ancient Friends*, should be obliged, in their own *Just Defence*, to have *Recourse to Print to Answer Print*.

'Tis so long ago as the Year 1692. that a Book, Intituled, *A Position and Testimony against all Swearing, &c.* was Printed and Dispersed among Friends, against Using such *Forms of Speech*, as are in the *Declaration of Fidelity and Solemn Affirmation*, in *Terrene or Worldly Matters*; which was soon after followed with a

A

Reprinted

The Preface to the Reader.

Reprinted Paper, without Date, Intituled, A Declaration from the People called Quakers, &c. to which the Dissatisfied added Queries at the Bottom, containing Suggestions against mentioning the Name of God in Temporal Affairs, as being contrary to Christ's Precept or Direction.

And then, that they might make this *Unhappy Difference* yet more Publick, whereby an *Odium* has been brought upon *Us*, as a *Body of People*, they, in their *Solicitation*, 1707. delivered *Printed Papers*, to the *Members of Parliament*, against the *Solemn Affirmation*, Intituled, *The Case of the People called Quakers, &c.* wherein they acquainted the *House*, That they think the *Title of the Act* seems to intimate, as if it [*The Solemn Affirmation*] was an *Oath*, (tho' not in the usual Form) and that there are *Expressions in the Affirmation* it self, which are too much like an *Oath*; of which *Mind* (as they told the *Parliament*) are the said *People in Scotland*, ---- and many of the said *People in the Northern Counties*, and divers other *Parts of England*.

This

The Preface to the Reader.

This made their Misunderstanding Publick enough; but, as if they were not content therewith, they again, in a *Solicitation*, 1711. dispersed *Printed Cases* against the *Solemn Affirmation*, Grounding their *Pretended Scruple* on Mentioning the *Sacred Name of God* in *Cases of Evidence*, &c. to the great *Reproach* of our *Holy Profession*, and the *Occasioning Reflections* on us, as if *We* would not have to do with *God* in *Matters of Justice and Righteousness* among *Men*. And to Justifie these their *Unwarrantable Practices*, they *Abstracted* the *Treatise of Oaths*, and *Printed* that *Part*, which they *thought* made against the *Solemn Affirmation*; tho' it is most *Evident*, that *that Book* was not written against *Solemn Affirming* in the *Name of God*, but (*Ex Professo*) against *All Oaths* and *Swearing* only. Was it then *Fairly* and *Ingenuously* done by *R---d M---s*, to expose a *Manuscript* of his own *Writing* to several *Friends* in *London*, which consisted of *Passages* collected out of the said *Treatise*, wherein he had, instead of the *Words Oaths* and *Swearing*, *Inserted* the *Word Affirmation*? And being asked by
A 2 a Friend,

The Preface to the Reader.

a Friend, What he meant by making such Alterations? He answered, If those Passages were read, as so altered, they would be as strong Arguments against the Solemn Affirmation, as against Oaths and Swearing. Let the *Honest Reader* consider, if such a Practice should be encouraged, how far, in Process of Time, it may affect the *Best of Books*, viz. the *Bible* it self.

But all they had hitherto done, was but a kind of *Praeludium*, the *Chief Force* and *Main Body* of their Arguments were behind, and kept in Reserve, 'till their *Skirmishing* should draw forth some of the *Satisfied* to take Notice of 'em; and accordingly when the *Letter from a Satisfied to a Dissatisfied Friend* was Published, they * then sent out their Cham-

* See Preface
to the Essay.

pion, that had so long lain Refreshing and Strengthening himself for *Battel*, I mean, the *Essay on Mat. 5.* a *Book* with which they are so mighty Big, and vainly suppose performs such Wonderful Things against the *Solemn Affirmation*, that it was thought high time to come forth against this *Boasting Philistine*;

The Preface to the Reader.

Philistine; the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, together with that of our Ancient Friends, being so nearly concerned in the Cause,

I have in the following Answer carefully avoided all unnecessary Digressions; and where Repetition is used, he that understands the Nature of *Controversial Writing*, may see Necessity required it.

It hath also been my Aim and Endeavour to keep a *Decorum* in Stile and Expression, and to use as soft Language as the Arguments would bear. In many Instances where the *Essayer* hath laid himself open enough to the Lash, there I have spared him; not Criticizing upon his putting *Veracity* for *Verity*, p. 10, 35. and talking of *Veracity* in the Inward Parts, p. 85, 86. nor Reproving him for that Odd Expression concerning Christ, viz. *Thereby wisely giving us to Understand*, &c. p. 10. as tho' Christ, who is Wisdom in Perfection, sometimes spake otherwise; nor for that Unphilosophical Passage, viz. that he (Man) had Voice or Speech given him, to enable him to hold a suitable Intercourse or Communication with the Divine Being, --- that

The Preface to the Reader.

that this was the Glorious State of Man in his Primitive Simplicity, and will be again in his Redeemed State, p. 84. as tho' Man's Converse with God was only by outward Speech in Paradise, and is to be so again, when Restored out of the Fall; Nor Censuring him for his many Slips in Grammar and Syntax: No, these and several other things, I have passed over, as beneath my present Cognizance; and applied my self to those Parts of his Treatise, wherein his Main Strength, as he supposes, lies; detecting his Fallacious Reasonings, Frequent Contradictions or Inconsistencies, and Palpable Perversions of Authors.

And, I hope, the *'Dissatisfied Friends* have so much Love to True Knowledge and Understanding, and such a Desire to be rightly Informed, touching the *Depending Controversie*, that they will seriously Read and Consider the following *Answer*, and diligently compare it with the *Holy Scriptures*, in Imitation of the *Noble Bereans*, who, on *Paul's* Preaching to them, *Searched the Scriptures, to see whether those things be declared to them,*
were

The Preface to the Reader.

were so; the design of this Book being for the better Information of those, who may have been Mised and Imposed upon by the Essay.

Now, that this Unhappy Difference may Issue in an Happy Peace, I Heartily Desire we may all Remember, that we are Brethren, and that all Things should be done with Charity, 1 Cor. 16. 14. that above all things (we should) put on Charity, Col. 3. 14. and have fervent Charity among (our) selves, for Charity shall cover the Multitude of Sins, 1 Pet. 4. 8. Charity suffereth long and is kind; yea, Charity never fails, 1 Cor. 13. 4, 8. And that we may Cry Day and Night unto our Gracious God, that of his Infinite Mercy, he would be pleased to Unite our Hearts to Him, and to one another, by his Blessed Spirit in the Bond of Peace, that our Jerusalem, or little City, may become again a Quiet Habitation, and her People the Praise of the whole Earth.

The 27th of the
12th Mo. 17¹³/₁₄

Richard Claridge.

ERRATA.

P. 18. l. 34. f. Impossible r. Possible. p. 26. Sect. 4. l. 6. f. Temporal as Religious r. Religious as Temporal. p. 48. l. 12. f. 3. r. 2. p. 85. l. 11. f. if r. of. If any other Literal Faults occur, the Reader is desired to Correct them.

The

The CONTENTS.

T HE Introduction.	Page 1
Sect. I. <i>Shewing, that the Author of the Essay insinuates the Affirmation to be an Oath.</i>	p. 7
Sect. II. <i>Of the Definition of an Oath, according to the Holy Scriptures.</i>	p. 9
Sect. III. <i>Shewing, the true Importance of Yea and Nay, or Affirmation and Negation.</i>	p. 15
Sect. IV. <i>Shewing, that the Essayer's new Notion, of Forms altogether extrinſick to the Matter to intitule them Oaths, &c. is more to puzzle his Reader, than of ſolid Argument; and that the Jews Swore as well in Religious as Temporal Matters.</i>	p. 20
Sect. V. <i>Wherein the Text, Mat. 5. 33, to 37. is Reſcu'd from the miſtaken Gloſs of the Eſſayer.</i>	p. 28
Sect. VI. <i>Shewing, that nothing is more than Yea and Nay, but True or False Swearing; Agreeable to the Treatiſe of Oaths, and the Eſſayer's own Rule.</i>	p. 39
Sect. VII. <i>Shewing the Errors and Inconſiſtencies, which the Eſſayer would lead his Readers into about an Oath; and yet ſuch is the Force of Truth, that he cannot but (even againſt himſelf) Confeſs and Acknowledge, in the main, to the true Definition of an Oath, &c.</i>	p. 49
Sect. VIII. <i>Containing ſome Teſtimonies of Friends, concerning the Lawfulneſs of the Reverent Uſing the Name of God in a Solemn Affirmation in Terrene Affairs, not mentioned in the Epiſtle from the Meeting for Sufferings, or Letter from a Satiſfied to a Diſſatiſfied Friend: With Answers to ſome Objections againſt a Form.</i>	p. 71
<i>Teſtimonies of Friends, viz. 1. John Whitehead. 2. Miles Halhead, Tho. Salthouſe. 3. James Parnel. 4. Will. Dewsbury. 5. Ed. Burroughs. 6. Fr. Howgil. 7. W. Gray, J. Findly, &c. 8. Ja. Naylor. 9. Samuel Fiſher. 10. G. Fox jun. 11. John Crook. 12. Iſaac Gray. 13. Marg. Fell. 14. James Piſton. 15. Gerv. Benſon. 16. S. Criſp. 17. John Banks. 18. John Bolton, Samuel Newton. 19. W. Penn. 20. Tho. Ellwood. 21. Roger Haydock. 22. G. Fox, John Burnyeat. 23. Thomas Taylor. 24. G. Whitehead. 25. Several Weſt-Country Friends. 26. John Blaykling. 27. A Manuſcript in 1690. 28. A Printed Half Sheet. 29. Rich. Aſhby, Daniel Phillips, &c. 30. John Field. 31. Richard Vivers. 32. John Whiting.</i>	

THE
Solemn Affirmation
DEFENDED, &c.

INTRODUCTION

WELL might Solomon say, *Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made Man upright; but they have sought out many Inventions.* Eccles. 7. 29.

Now this Uprightness consisted in the inward Man's being govern'd by the Spirit of God, and the outward Man's being govern'd by the inward. But when Man fell from his Maker, and the Uprightness wherein he was made, he suffer'd the Senses of his outward Man to usurp the Government of those of his inward Man, and to draw them from the Dominion and Government of God's Spirit.

The Senses of the outward Man are exercised in and about the Creatures, they being suited and adapted to visible things; But the Senses of the inward Man, when quicken'd again by Grace, are exercised in and about God, and the things of his blessed Spirit, to which Invisible things they are suited and adapted.

No wonder therefore, when Men give themselves up to the Government of the Senses of their outward Man, that they lead them from God, into the Creatures; and then, that they may endeavour to

satisfie the Senses of their inward Man, which being withdrawn from God, feel an Emptiness and Distress, it is not strange that they should seek out many Inventions.

Hence have proceeded all the Superstition, the Voluntary Humility, and Worshipping of Angels, intruding into those things which are not seen, vainly puffed up by a Fleshly Mind, which so much abound among those, who are too zealous and busie about Outsidess.

This is a subtil Bait of Satan, with which he took the Pharisees among the Jews, and the Gnosticks among the Primitive Christians; which latter, 'tis supposed, the Apostle meant in the Passage above alluded to, in Col. 2. 18. they pretending to more Knowledge, Wisdom, and Exactness, than the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; which things have indeed (said the Apostle) a shew of Wisdom in Will-worship and Humility, and Neglecting (Punishing, or not sparing) of the Body, Ver. 23.

We (as well as the Primitive Christians) began in the Spirit, and what are we now made perfect by the Flesh? Gal. 3. 3. What! shall the Fleshly Wisdom of Man usurp the Throne of Christ, and give Laws? God forbid! When the Enemy of Mankind finds himself discover'd, in respect to the gross Pollutions of the World, then he would cheat Man with his own Righteousness, and the Activity of his own depraved Reason; and possess him with an Opinion of his Good and Godlike Estate, and with Uncharitable Thoughts of others, as Libertines, Publicans, &c. not unlike the Pharisee in the Parable, Luke 18. 9, to 14. This is perverting the very Order and Nature of things, to set up the Outward Man, or the Outward Senses, and Depraved Reason, as Judge and Controller in the things of God.

And what can we reasonably think will be the Consequence! but that, as God is Love, and his Government is a most Sweet and Peaceable Government, full of Long-suffering and great Kindness; so,

on the contrary, Man's Government or Conduct, in his own Spirit, is Harsh and Censorious, pretending *Conscience* as a Cover for Refusing to Agree, that others should enjoy the *Liberty* of theirs; and thereby Sacrificing the Peace of Society to the Arbitrary Dictates of Despotick Will. Where-ever these *Fruits* appear, we may be sure they are not of God; but are infallible Marks of a *Departing from the Spirit, and seeking Perfection by the Flesh.*

When the Day of God dawned, and broke forth on our *Friends* in the Beginning, and his *Light* shined in and upon their *inward Man*, and gave them a true Knowledge and Sense of, and a living and divine Faith in, Him; they found themselves under a Necessity to bring their Reason and outward Senses to a Silence, and from being Governors, to become Governed by that of the inward Man, the *hidden Man of the Heart*. Then Faith, (which the *Just* lives by) and not *Corrupt Reason*, and the Senses of the outward Man, (which ruled among many Professors in that Day,) was exalted and magnified, to the Glory of God, and the Peace and Tranquillity of their inward Man; the Senses thereof being filled with God, and his most Blessed Spirit. *O Glorious! O Blessed Beginning!*

And out of the Depth of *Jordan*, mystically, they brought forth Stones, or *Testimonies*, which they set up as Memorials for the Church in future Ages, agreeable to the Primitive Christians; and particularly, the Testimony of *Mentioning the Name of GOD*, on account of our *Declaring Truth in Cases of Evidence, &c.* instead of *Swearing*.

And while we kept to the Divinity, and Simplicity of Faith, and shut out Carnal Reasonings and Imaginations, we were a *People of One Heart, and One Way*, respecting this Testimony; as the Sense of our *Worthy Antients*, and even of our *Yearly Meeting*, so lately as 1692, and 1696. clearly shews.

BUT when Doubts and Objections were raised in the Reasoning Part in some *Friends*, by the Book intituled, *A Position and Testimony against all Swearing, &c.* Printed 1692. and dispersed among *Friends*

* Whose Motive thereunto, and Design therein, touching Government, is well known, viz. not to be so much against Declaring in the Form our *Friends* had offer'd, or accepted in the *Declaration of Fidelity*, with the Name of God in it, as to serve an Unwarrantable Turn, and make *Profelytes* at that Juncture, when the Author himself thought fit to suffer, rather than come into the Revolution.

in a Clandestine way; and written, as 'tis said, by *John Fisher*, * which seems contrived to confound the Understandings of Men, by endeavouring to suggest *That to be an Oath in Civil or Worldly Matters*, which is *not so in Religious*; and which, I believe, may be justly call'd a *Novelty*; for that, I think, One Instance cannot be given of any Man of common Understanding, of any *Persuasion*

whatsoever, that ever Broach'd such a Notion before :

THEN, Then it was, that Uneasiness and Dissatisfaction began to appear among some, to the great Trouble and Regret of others.

And as this *Novel Notion* came not from Faith, but from the Invention of Man; so, where-ever the same has been entertain'd, no wonder if it hath bewilder'd its Embracers, and led some into a Variety, and others into a direct Contrariety, of Reasonings and Arguments upon the Subject.

And if ever the Apostacy enters among us, as it has done among Societies before us, it will be by preferring *Fancy* to *Faith*, and *Corrupt* to *Right Reason*; and this will affect our *Ministry*, *Discipline*, and very *Vitals*, as a Society: Which God in his infinite Mercy avert, by turning us more *Inward*, in this Day of *Outward Ease* and *Tranquillity*, that we may not *Legalize* the *Gospel*, and fall into that inward Barrenness and Emptiness before the Lord, which are the natural Consequences of living in,
and

and following the low and lifeless Principle of corrupt Reason, and vain Imaginations.

The last Yearly Meeting (viz. 1713.) having, in their Minute sent to the several Quarterly Meetings of Friends, testified against calling the Solemn Affirmation an Oath; and a Book intituled, *An Essay on the Fifth of Matthew, from Verse 33, to 37.* having insinuated its being an Oath; I thought my self obliged, being fully satisfied of the contrary from the Scriptures of Truth, as it hath pleased the Lord by his Spirit to open them to my Understanding, to shew Friends in general the mistaken Positions, and fallacious Arguments of that Book: And in order thereunto, I shall comprize mine Answer under the following Sections:

I. By shewing, that the Author of the Essay insinuates the Affirmation to be an Oath.

II. By Defining an Oath, according to the Holy Scriptures.

III. By shewing the True Importance of Yea and Nay, or Affirmation and Negation.

IV. By shewing, that the Essayer, in his new Notion (of Forms altogether Extrinsic to the Matter, to intitle them Oaths; and that any Form, not Extrinsic to the Matter, cannot be deem'd an Oath,) discovers more of a design to Confound and Puzzle his Reader, than of solid Argument. In Opposition to which I shall prove from Scripture, that Oaths were taken by the Jews, as well in Religious, as Terrene or Civil Matters.

V. By Rescuing the Text, Mat. 5. 33, to 37. from the mistaken Gloss of the Essayer.

VI. By

VI. By shewing, that nothing is more than Yea or Nay, but True or False Swearing; and that this being the plain and explicit Doctrine of the Treatise of Oaths, (where it Treats, *Ex professo*, of the Subject) out of which near all the Quotations and Authorities in the Essay are taken; the said Quotations and Authorities ought to be understood according to the Sense of the Authors of that Treatise, where they explain the Words, Whatsoever is more than these, &c. And that so to understand them, is agreeable to the Essayer's own Rule, p. 49.

VII. By shewing the Errors and Inconsistencies, which the Essayer would lead his Readers into, about an Oath: And yet such is the Force of Truth, that he cannot but (even against himself) Confess and Acknowledge, in the main, the true Definition of an Oath, &c.

Lastly, By adding some Testimonies of Friends, concerning the Lawfulness of the Reverent Using the Name of GOD in a Solemn Affirmation in Terrene Affairs, not mentioned in the Epistle from the Meeting for Sufferings, &c. Anno 1696. Or, in the Letter from a Satisfied to a Dissatisfied Friend, &c. Anno 1713. With Answers to some Objections against a Form.

SECTION I.

Shewing, That the Author of the Essay insinuates the Affirmation to be an Oath.

HE says, "That when Oaths were lawful, it was judged a Swearing by the Name of God to Attest it, Page 4." "It was (says he) a General Form of Swearing, as well amongst those, whose God was the true God, as those who attested their Idol-Gods, *The Lord liveth, Thy God (O Dan) liveth*, p. 5. "These Instances (says he) may suffice to shew, that the Attesting the Name of God, was look'd upon (in those times) even by the Lord himself (as represented by the Mouth of his Prophet) sufficient to denominate those Forms of Speech, in which it was so used, *Oaths*, p. 6.

Now by *Attesting* the Name of God in his Sense, he intends *Mentioning* the Name of God, in giving Testimony or Evidence, as appears from his turning "*Mentioning* the Names of the Heathen Gods, as in *Josh. 23. 7.* into *Attesting*, p. 13. and from p. 14, 35, 44.

From these three Quotations it follows, on his *Hypothesis*, that the *Mentioning* the Name of God in giving Evidence, as in the *Affirmation*, may be deem'd an *Oath*.

Again, he says, "There is this general Rule to be observed throughout all those Forms of Speech, that there is something more or less (express'd or imply'd) that is neither Essential nor Relative to the Matters the Oaths are made to, but altogether Extrinsic thereunto, used purely to add a Sanction or Credit to the Attestation; and that I conceive, whether it be more or less, whether

Explicit

“ Explicit or Implicit, by Ceremony or without, is
 “ what most justly intitles such Forms of Speech to
 “ be accounted *Oaths*, p. 11, 12. See also p. 46.

And he says, “ Whether that Attestation hath
 “ been by way of Imprecation, or by way of Asse-
 “ veration, (*The Lord liveth*) when the so Using or
 “ Implying of it hath been no way Essential, nor
 “ hath had any special or necessary Relation to the
 “ Matter attested; then, and in such Cases, such
 “ Forms of Speech have been deemed *Oaths*, p. 18.

And again, he says, “ Here we see the *Affirmation*
 “ is intended another, if it be another, Medium in-
 “ stead of an *Oath*, p. 72, 73.

Mark, if it be another: So that 'tis plain he don't
 admit it for another Medium.

And “ the Holy Scriptures (*says he*) which are the
 “ highest External Authority that can be produced,
 “ inform us, that plain Asseverations have been ac-
 “ counted *Oaths*, -- yea, that *the Lord liveth* (which
 “ is but a plain Asseveration) was the *Legal Oath*,
 &c. p. 87.

Again, he says, “ This Form of Speech then (to
 “ wit, *The Lord liveth*) being but a Solemn Assevera-
 “ tion, and yet being that *Oath*, &c. p. 88.

An Asseveration (*says he*) including the Name of
 “ God, was commanded by the Lord, as the proper
 “ *Oath* under the Law, p. 91.

These Six Quotations, with the Three preceding,
 do very plainly and evidently prove, that the *Essayer*
 insinuates (at least) the *Affirmation* to be an *Oath*,
 and that he would have others look upon it as
 such; which gives me just Cause and Reason for
 this Undertaking, the same being so manifestly
 contrary to the Judgment, not only of former Yearly
 Meetings, but of the very last, in which both *Satisfied*
 and *Dissatisfied* Joyn'd.

S E C T. II.

*Of the Definition of an Oath, according to
the Holy Scriptures.*

TH^{O'} the *Essayer* hath collected *several Forms of Speech* out of the Old Testament, some of which were accounted Oaths, and asserted (tho' erroneously) that an *Asseveration* (including the Name of God) was commanded by the Lord, as the Proper Oath under the Law, p. 91. yet he hath no where in his *Essay* been pleased to tell us, what an Oath is; nor indeed can it be expected he ever should, according to the Plan he hath conceived, which is this, "An Oath (saith he) "is not, nor cannot be confined to a certain Number of Words, or Form of Speech, so as to receive its Definition therefrom, p. 8, 9. And having laid down this precarious *Hypothesis*, he tells us, "That his adducing those several Instances of Differing Forms heretofore used, is not with Intent to draw a Conclusion from thence, what is an Oath; but rather to shew the *Impossibility* of forming a true Judgment thereupon, p. 9. As tho' the Variety of Forms used in *Swearing* under the Law, was an Argument against the Possibility of attaining to the Definition of an Oath.

This, I confess, is a great Point, and had it been as well proved, as 'tis confidently asserted, it might have been serviceable to him in his Undertaking. But his Unhappiness is, he proves not one Tittle of it; and from his Deficiency therein, one may reasonably conclude, he had no Proof to offer; but that resolving to defend an Opinion he had entertain'd, and unwilling to relinquish, he was hurry'd upon the Absurdity of maintaining it by a Proofless Assertion.

But at this Rate, what may not a Man adventure at? First lay down a Position that is untrue, and then, taking that for a Truth, advance upon it

Sermons concerning the Divinity and Incarnation of our B. Saviour, p. 96. Edit. 1693.

what he has a mind to? "For do
"but give a Man leave (saith Arch-
Bishop Tillotson) "to suppose what
"he pleases, and he may prove what
"he will, and avoid any Difficulty
"whatsoever that can be objected
"to him. But says he, just before, "There is no
"surer Sign that a Cause is greatly distress'd, than
"to be driven to such a Shift.

But that this Shift will not answer the *Effayer's* Design, in rendering the Definition of an Oath impossible, from the different Forms of Speech, which were accounted Oaths under the Law; I shall produce some of those Forms, and shew, that the Definition of an Oath may be collected from them, and a true Judgment formed thereupon.

1. *The Lord do so to me, and more also, if ought but Death part thee and me,* said Ruth to her Mother-in-law Naomi, Ruth 1. 17.

2. *So and more also do God unto the Enemies of David, if I leave of all that pertain to him, &c.* 1 Sam. 25. 22.

3. *So do God to Abner, (said Abner) and more also, except as the Lord hath sworn to David, even so I do to him,* 2 Sam. 3. 9.

4. *God do so to me, and more also, (said David) if thou (viz. Amasa) be not Captain of the Host before me continually in the room of Joab,* 2 Sam. 19. 13.

5. *King Solomon sware by the Lord, saying, God do so to me, and more also, if Adonijah have not spoken this Word against his own Life,* 1 Kings 2. 23.

6. *David sware, saying, So do God to me, and more also, if I taste Bread, or ought else, till the Sun be down,* 2 Sam. 3. 35.

In every one of these Forms, and whatever Forms
else

else were accounted True and Lawful Oaths, as used among Men, under the Law, are,

1. The Object, which was God alone.
2. The Covenant, which was to Speak or Act in Truth. And
3. The Bond, by an Imprecation or Curse, to be inflicted by God upon the Covenant-Breaker.

These were the Parts of a True and Lawful Oath, as used among Men, under the Law, and are contained in the Forms aforesaid.

Now I desire the *Reader* to consider, whether we may not draw a Conclusion from thence, what an Oath was, *viz.*

A Binding the Soul to God with a Bond, therein Covenanting to Speak or Act in Truth, by an Imprecation, Curse, or Penalty, to be inflicted by God upon the Covenant-Breaker; which is its Definition.

In every True and Lawful Oath, as used among Men, under the Law, there always was an *Imprecation*, either express'd or understood; but in the Forms aforementioned 'tis express'd, *God do so to me, and more also, &c.*

With which agrees the common Form of *Swearing* used in *England*, (*viz. So help me God, &c.*) which *R. B.* in his *Apology* calls an *Imprecation*, p. 550.

And the *Essayer*, on the last of the Scriptures before quoted, says, "So that when they imprecated, or called upon God, &c. as in *David's Case*, 2 Sam. 3. 35. it is plain, they desired God to deal with them, as they performed their Words or Promises, which (*says he*) is a very Ample and Perfect FORM of an OATH, p. 13.

By which he hath agreed in the main to the true Definition of an *Oath*, tho' in Contradiction to himself, who made it impossible to Form a true Judgment thereupon, in p. 9. But it seems he did not then know what Impossibilities he should be able to perform in Four Pages more.

So that to *Swear*, is to *Imprecate*; and therefore where we read, such an one did *Swear*, we are to understand he did *Imprecate*, or *Call for a Curse or Mischief on himself*, &c. if he did not do as he said, and not think that the Words which we read, he *Said*, is all we are to understand by the Words, he *Swore*; for if the Words he expressed should not contain an *Imprecation* in them, yet the word *Swear* included it.

Hence it follows, that a *Simple Affeuration*, or Earnest Affirming, tho' the *Name of God* be mentioned in it, is no *Oath*.

And this is back'd not only with the Sense of our Yearly Meeting, in the Years 1692. and 1696. (as may be seen in the *Letter from a Satisfied to a Dissatisfied Friend*) but also with the Authority of the last, and former Parliaments; for in divers Acts of the last Parliament, viz. Two several Acts, for *Laying Duties on Hides*, &c. and in One other Act, for *Laying Duties on Soap, Paper*, &c. Instead of the *Oath* therein enjoin'd Others, it's said, "*If Quakers, then their Solemn Affirmation*." And the *Affirmation-Act* it self, passed by a former Parliament, having Excepted the Use thereof to Qualifie us for *Evidences in Life or Death*, and for *Jurymen*, shews very plainly, that our Legislators would not have render'd us Un capable by it, to take on us the Burthensome Office of *Jurymen*, &c. if they had intended, or esteemed it an *Oath*: They being not willing to subject the Lives or Estates of Men to Twelve Persons, but upon *Oath*.

Now since the Definition of an *Oath* is truly stat- ed, according to the Holy Scriptures, and the *Essayer* hath surmounted his supposed Impossibility, as a- foresaid; all that either he, or others of the Dis- satisfied Friends have said, or can say from *Jer. 4. 2.* and *3. 2.* and *12. 16.* or any other places of like im- port, to endeavour to amuse Mankind, as if only say- ing, *The Lord liveth*, is an *Oath*, easily vanisheth.

For

For where-ever we read that any *Swore* in Scripture, we are to understand, that they did by express Words, as in the Instances before given, or by necessary Implication, by Sign, Ceremony or Token, *Imprecate, or call for a Curse, or Mischief on themselves, &c.* if they did not do as they said: Or, that "God would deal with them as they performed their Words or Promises, which (*as the Essayer words it, p. 13.*) "is a very AMPLE and PERFECT FORM of an OATH.

So that according to his Concession in this Place, all *Forms of Oaths*, which had not this *Ample and Perfect Form of an Oath* expressed, were *Imperfect Forms*, and therefore the same must be necessarily implied; and this the *Essayer* confesses to, in express Words, saying, "And this being really implied, is "therefore called an *Oath*, and as really is so, as if "the Words of Imprecation had been expressed, as "in *David's Case*: And the not admitting of this "Implication, really makes void the end of the Expression, p. 15.

And this is not all, but he farther adds, and confesses, that "when any used a more Obscure "Form, as, *The Lord liveth*, though there was no "Imprecation, yet Holy Writ hath deem'd it an "Oath.--- For is it not as much as to say, *As sure "as the Lord liveth* (it is so, or so?) Or, *As he lives, "and is able to punish me for Non-performance of my "Words?* &c. Now these (or such) things (*says he*) "are naturally inferable from it, p. 13. See p. 14. to the same purpose.

And indeed, to "make the Great God of Heaven "a Witness, or a Judge in any Matter to appear "by some signal Approbation or Judgment, to help "or forsake him, as the Truth or Falseness of his "Oath requires, when he saith, *So help me God*; is the Description the *Treatise of Oaths* gives of an *Oath*, p. 17, 18.

Which

Which Quotation out of the *Treatise of Oaths*, undeniably proves the Authors Sense of an Oath to be the same for Substance with the Definition of an Oath before given, collected from the Instances out of the Old Testament, viz. A Binding of the Soul to God with a Bond, therein Covenanting to Speak or Act in Truth, by an *Imprecation*, *Curse* or *Penalty*, to be inflicted by God upon the Covenant-Breaker; and so consequently, that an *Asseveration* is not an Oath, as they teach, p. 101. saying, "Eos
" that of Paul's was but an *Asseveration*."

And again, they say, p. 103. "But mark, that
" the word *Oath*, or *Swear*, used both by *Christ* and
" the Apostle *James* in their Prohibition, is never
" used by *Paul* in his *Asseverations*."

"So that (say they in the same Page) such as will
" have it, that *Paul* Swore, must bring the word
" *Swear*, or *Oath*, to prove it."

From whence it evidently appears, that there was no True and Lawful Oath, as used among Men, without Binding of the Soul to God with a Bond, as aforesaid, by an *Imprecation* or *Curse*, &c. and that *Paul* in using *Asseverations*, in which the Name of God is mentioned, did not *Imprecate* or *Swear*; and consequently the *Present Affirmation*, being no *Imprecation*, or Calling upon God for a *Curse*, but only an *Asseveration*; without the words *Oath* or *Swear*, can be no *Oath*.

And that the Learned and Judicious *Erasmus* had the same sense of an *Oath*, appears very plainly from the Authors of the *Treatise of Oaths*, who quote him, p. 129. out of his *Comment* on *Mat. 5.* saying, "In your Bargains ye need no *Oath*, ye need no Ex-
" ecration, or *Cursing*, or such like, to bind the Pro-
" miser, or to assure him to whom the Promise is
" made; Two Words be sufficient, *Nay* and *Yea*.
And that the *Affirmation* is but *Yea*, is proved in the next Section.

SECT. III.

Shewing, The True Importance of Yea and Nay, or Affirmation and Negation.

HAVING clearly Defined what an Oath was, as used among Men, according to the Holy Scriptures, viz. A Binding of the Soul to God with a Bond, therein Covenanting to Speak or Act in Truth, by an *Imprecation* or *Curse*, to be inflicted by God upon the Covenant-Breaker: It now seems very proper that I treat of *Yea* and *Nay*, or *Affirmation* and *Negation*. And if by comparing any Modes of Speech with the Definition of an Oath, it appears, that such Expressions contain not expressly nor intentionally, an *Imprecation* or *Curse*; then, and in such Case, those Expressions ought not to be deemed Oaths.

And with this agrees BASILIUS MAGNUS, as quoted in the *Treatise of Oaths*, who says, "There are some Speeches which have the Forms (or Appearance) of Oaths, and yet are no Oaths at all, but rather Remedies to persuade. *Treatise of Oaths*, p. 61.

Again, Bp. SANDERSON in his *Oxford-Lectures* shews, that "that is sometimes used in the Form of an Oath, which is no Oath; and so (say the Friends who wrote the *Treatise of Oaths*) "he defendeth Joseph from breaking God's Command; that is, not to have Sworn so; and therefore not to have sinned, but to have used an *Asseveration*, as if he had said, *as sure as Pharaoh liveth, ye are Spies*; (and say those Friends) "So may Paul be defended against the breaking Christ's Command, as if he had said, *as sure as ye*; or, as some Greek Copies have it, *we rejoice in Christ Jesus*. Ibid. p. 101, 102.

By

By which it appears that those worthy Friends, who wrote the *Treatise of Oaths*, did not only agree with the above-cited Authors, but that both them, and the said Authors; plainly teach, that the *Reverent Mentioning the Name of God in an Asseveration, is no Oath, or Sin*. How exceedingly then hath this *Essayer* perverted their Sense?

And then if such Forms of Speech are not *Oaths*, what are they to be esteemed, but *Yea* or *Nay*; i. e. *Affirmation* or *Negation*; according to these express Words in the said *Treatise of Oaths*, (which the Dissatisfied themselves have published in their *Abstract*, p. 11. viz.) “Nor is there any thing more than *Yea* and *Nay* besides *Perjury*, which can be intended, but an *Oath*; and therefore that was intended?” Ibid. p. 23.

Note, This is not only the plain and express Judgment of those our Ancient Friends, but the Dissatisfied have, by publishing with Approbation these very same Words, just now quoted out of the *Treatise of Oaths*, consequentially Confessed to the same Truth.

Here I might give over any farther Scrutiny in the Case, having not only the *Treatise of Oaths*, but also the Dissatisfied’s own Confession in my Favour, that those Forms of Speech which do not make *Oaths*, are no more than *Yea* and *Nay*; and therefore are only *Affirmation*, or *Negation*.

But that I may leave the Dissatisfied entirely without Excuse, I shall proceed to a special Disquisition of the Subject, viz. *Affirmation*, and *Negation*, &c. Thus,

A *Yea*, or *Affirmation*, by way of Evidence, or Attestation, for the Discovery of Truth, and Distribution of Justice, according to a good Conscience, must be *Such a Mode of Speech*, as expresseth or implieth all that is necessary thereunto: Which may be consider’d either as a *Yea*, or *Affirmation*, in which the Name or Power of God is not expressed, tho’

tho' implied; Or a *Yea*, or *Affirmation*, in which the Name or Power of God is expressed.

In the *First* Case, the *Second* is necessarily imply'd; for the Name and Power of God is so essentially related to *Truth-speaking*, that without him we can do nothing, John 15. 5. And therefore, tho' in *Yea*, or *Affirmation*, we should not express the Name of God, yet 'tis impossible but that it must be understood, if the *Yea*, or *Affirmation*, be made in *Truth* and *Righteousness*.

And in the *Second* Case of *Yea*, or *Affirmation*, the same being but what's implied in the *First*, cannot be more in *Nature* than the *First*; and consequently, the *First* way of Affirming is not a more Excellent way of Affirming (as some think) than the *Second*; but the *Second* is more Excellent than the *First*, because the *Second* expresseth what the *First* only implies: For we are to *Acknowledge God* in all our Ways, Prov. 3. 6. To *Confess Christ* before Men, Mat. 10. 32. Every Tongue is to *Confess* to God, Rom. 14. 11. Whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we are to do all to the *Glory of God*, 1 Cor. 10. 31.

And the *Presence of God* being necessarily related to *Terrene* or *Civil Affairs*, as well as to *Religious*; it must needs be lawful, on a good Occasion, to mention it in one Case, as well as in the other.

Let your Speech be alway with Grace, seasoned with Salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every Man, Col. 4. 6. If this Text be compared with Mat. 5. 37. we may find the Apostle's Words are a Summary Explication of our Saviour's; Let your Communication, saith Christ, be *Yea, Yea; Nay, Nay*; for whatsoever is more than these, cometh of Evil. Let your Speech, saith the Apostle, be alway with Grace, seasoned with Salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every Man. *ἅπαρ ὁ λόγος* is the Phrase in both places, that is, Your Communication, Word or Speech: So that they both respect one thing, the Grace exactly

ably answering the *Yea, Yea*. The Apostle adds ~~more~~ *always*, to exclude the Restriction of it to Religious Matters, and to shew, that Christians ought in all Cases, and at all Times, to have such a Reverent Regard to Almighty God, who is the Giver of all Grace, that they always Speak as in his *Presence*, and by their Speech may administer Grace unto the Hearers.

The Argument from the Apostle's Words stands in Form thus ;

If our Communication, Word or Speech, ought to be *always* with Grace, then it is our Duty in all Cases, and at all Times, to have such a Reverent Regard to Almighty God, who is the Giver of all Grace, that we may always Speak as in his *Presence*, &c.

But our Communication, Word or Speech, ought to be *always* with Grace ;

Therefore, &c.

The *Minor* cannot be denied, without an express Contradiction to the Apostle.

And if the Consequence of the *Major* be excepted against, and disallowed with respect to *Terrene* Affairs, but admitted in *Religious*, the *Universal, Always*, fully confutes that Distinction. For how can it be *Always*, if not in *Terrene*, as well as *Religious* Affairs? Besides, the Words of the Apostle, *Ver. 5.* where he Exhorts the Saints and Faithful Brethren, to *Walk in Wisdom toward them that are without*, that is, such as are not of the *Household of Faith*, do imply, that we should give a Demonstration to them, both by our Words and Actions, even in *Terrene* Affairs, that we are Worshipers of the True and Living God ; which how is it impossible for us to do, if when we are required to Declare a Truth, relating to a Temporal Matter, in his *Presence*, we refuse it? Would not such a Refusal put them upon Questioning, whether we are what we pretend to be? and lay a Stumbling-Block in
their

their Way about our Holy Profession, contrary to the Advice of the Apostle, who would have us give no Offence to the Jews or Gentiles, no less than to the Church of God, 1 Cor. 10. 32.

Again, the Apostle Paul said, *The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ ----- knoweth that I lie not.* (In saying what? why that) *In Damascus, the Governor under Aretas the King, kept the City of the Damascenes with a Garison, desirous to apprehend me; and through a Window in a Basket was I let down by the Wall, and escaped his hands,* 2 Cor. 11. 31, 32, 33.

When Priscilla and Aquila desired him (the Apostle Paul) to tarry longer time with them (at Ephesus,) he consented not; but bad them Farewel, saying, I must by all means keep this Feast at Jerusaleem: But I will return again unto you, If the Lord will, Acts 18. 20, 21.

But I will come to you shortly, If the Lord will, 1 Cor. 4. 19.

But I trust to tarry a while with you, If the Lord permit, 1 Cor. 16. 7.

Now the things which I write unto you, behold, Before God I lie not, Gal. 1. 20.

In all these Places the Apostle speaks of his Escape, Journeying, or Travelling, &c. And though it was upon the Account of the Gospel, yet still his Escape, Journeying, or Travelling, was a Temporal Matter, and in discoursing thereof, he Attests, or makes Use of the Name of God, as well as when treating of Religious Affairs.

The Apostle James recommends it as a Duty, to Mention the Name of the Lord in Worldly Matters and Purposes, *For that ye ought to say, (or as the Greek may be render'd, instead of your saying) If the Lord will, we shall live, and do this or that,* Jam. 4. 15.

From what hath been argued in this Section, touching the True Importance of *Yea* and *Nay*, or *Affirmation* and *Negation*; it cannot, without Violence to the Holy Scriptures, and Right Reason, be denied, but that the *Solemn Affirmation* is no more

than *Yes*, rightly understood; and that the same is a more Excellent way of Affirming, than an *Affirmation* without mentioning the *Name* or *Power* of *God*; because such an *Affirmation* only implies what the other expresses, as above.

S E C T. IV.

Shewing, That the Effayer's new Notion, of Forms altogether extrinsick to the Matter to intitle them Oaths, &c. is more to Puzzle his Reader, than of solid Argument: And that the Jews Swore as well in Temporal as Religious Matters.

THE Effayer's Notion of *Forms* altogether extrinsick to the Matter to intitle them to be Oaths, and that any Form, not extrinsick to the Matter, cannot be deemed an Oath, may very truly be called *New*: For, I think, 'twas never Published in Print by any Man, before he laid down this *General Rule*, as he calls it, viz.

“That there is something more or less (express'd or imply'd) that is neither Essential nor Relative to the Matters the Oaths are made to, but altogether extrinsick thereunto, used purely to add a Sanction or Credit to the Attestation: And that I conceive (whether it be more or less, whether explicit or implicit, by Ceremony or without) is what most justly intitles such Forms of Speech to be accounted Oaths, p. 12.

“We have (*says the Effayer again*) laid it down for a General Rule, that in all Forms of Speech
“there

“ there must be something more or less (express’d
 “ or imply’d) that is neither Essential, nor hath any
 “ necessary Relation to the Matter; but altogether
 “ extrinsick thereunto, used purely to add a San-
 “ ction, or Credit, to the Evidence, or Attesta-
 “ tion, to intitle such Forms of Speech to be *Oaths*,
 p. 46.

Here he hath told us *Positively*, what (in his Opin-
 ion) may intitle Forms of Speech to be *Oaths*.
 Now let us hear him *Negatively*, what, in his Opin-
 ion, cannot be deemed *Oaths*; and this is a greater
 Rarity than the former.

He says, The Apostle’s “ so doing (*viz.* in the
 Immediate Openings of the Word of Life, Attest-
 ing a Divine Witness, to evidence his Testimony)
 “ or Attesting the Name of God (LET IT HAVE
 “ BEEN DONE IN WHAT FORM SOEVER) cannot be
 “ deemed an *Oath*; since it was Essential, or at least
 “ had a necessary Relation to the Matter, to which
 “ it was used, p. 46.

I shall begin with his *Negative*; which asserts the
 utter Impossibility of *Swearing*, in the *Immediate*
Openings of the Word of Life, or in Religious Mat-
 ters, under a Divine Influence: Which makes me
 think, he does not use to read the Holy Scriptures
 so diligently as he should, that he can advance a
 Notion so Repugnant thereunto. For we read
 that,

They (*viz.* the People of Israel) entred into a Co-
 venant to seek the Lord God of their Fathers, with all
 their Heart, and with all their Soul; that whosoever
 would not seek the Lord God of Israel, should be put to
 Death, whether Small or Great, whether Man or Wo-
 man. And they Swore unto the Lord with a loud Voice,
 &c. And all Judah rejoiced at the Oath: For they had
 Sworn with all their Heart, and sought him with their
 whole Desire, and he was found of them, 2 Chron. 13.
 12, 13, 14, 15.

Now will the *Effayer*, or any Man else, tell us, that these People were not under the *Immediate Openings of the Word of Life*? That they were not under the *Influence, and Guidance of the Spirit of God*? When the Text says, *They entered into a Covenant to seek the Lord God of their Fathers, with all their Heart, and with all their Soul*, ver. 12. And that they sought him with their whole Desire, and that he was found of them, ver. 15. And yet that they Swore unto the Lord, and rejoiced at the Oath.

Now, what higher Act of Devotion is there, than to seek the Lord with all our Heart, and with all our Soul? And what more Blessed Influence of the *Divine Presence* in this World, than to seek him with our whole Desire, and to find him?

These *Immediate Openings of the Word of Life* they were under; and yet, even in and under them, the Holy Ghost, in the Holy Scriptures, tells us they Swore.

So that if we will believe the *Holy Ghost*, and not the *Effayer*, this People had found a Form and Way to Swear, in the *Immediate Openings of the Word of Life*.

Again, the People of the *Jews* are said to have made a sure Covenant, to have Seal'd it; and to have enter'd into a Curse, and into an Oath, to walk in God's Law, which was given by *Moses the Servant of God*, and to observe, and do all the *Commandments of the Lord their Lord, and his Judgments and his Statutes*, Nehem. 9. 38. and 10. 1, 29. And this, not in an Ordinary Way, but as the Extraordinary Effect of a Solemn Fast, and Repentance of the People, Nehem. 9.

Shall we say, this was not done in the *Immediate Openings of the Word of Life*? God forbid!

Here then are two full and clear Proofs against this *Effayer*. To which I shall add the Texts following, viz.

Then arose *Ezra*, and made the Chief Priests, Levites and all *Israel* to Swear, that they would do according to this

this Word; (i. e. to put away their strange Wives, according to the Command of God, Ezra 9. 12. and 10. 2, 3.) And they Swore, Ezra 10 5. 1 Esdras 8. 96.

Then I called the Priests, (said Nehemiah) and took an Oath of them, that they should do according to this Promise, (i. e. to make Restoration for the Usury they had taken, contrary to the Law which God had given them, Exod. 22. 25.) And, says he, I shook my Lap, and said, So God shake out every Man from his House, and from his Labour, that performeth not this Promise, even thus be he shaken out and emptied, (Heb. empty or void) and all the Congregation said Amen, Neh. 5. 12, 13.

All these Scripture-proofs do, First, sufficiently demonstrate, that Oaths were made and sworn in Religious Matters, and even under a Divine Influence, or in the Immediate Openings of the Word of Life, as the *Essayer* expresses it.

Secondly, That the *Essayer's* asserting, that "Attesting the Name of God, (let it have been done in what Form soever) in the Immediate Openings of the Word of Life, cannot be deem'd an Oath," is a very Erroneous and Anti-scriptural Position; and such a Manifest Imposing upon Innocent and Harmless People, as, one would think, should hardly have been attempted.

Thirdly, Seeing it is evident, from the Scriptures aforesaid, that the Jews did Swear, in the Immediate Openings of the Word of Life; and if their so Attesting the Name of God, makes it Essential, or at least to have a necessary Relation to the Matter to which it was used; then it clearly appears, there were Oaths made, not altogether extrinick to the Matter: And so consequently his *General Rule*, as he calls it, p. 46. is also very defective and erroneous, viz. "That in all Forms of Speech, there must be something more or less (express'd or imply'd) that is neither Essential, nor hath any necessary Relation to

“ to the Matter ; but altogether extrinſick there-
 “ unto, uſed purely to add a Sanction, or Credit,
 “ to the Evidence, or Atteſtation, to intitule ſuch
 “ Forms of Speech to be Oaths.

But if this *General Rule* of his, which doubtleſs
 was calculated to *Condemn the Affirmation*, had been
 True, and would have born the *Teſt of Holy Writ* ;
 yet it would not have affected the *Affirmation*, or
 have proved it an *Oath* ; becauſe *God, his Name,*
Power and Preſence, are not extrinſick to *Truth in*
Speech : We cannot ſpeak *Truth without Him, his Pre-*
ſence, &c. but the ſame are *Effential* ; or neceſſarily
 Related, to *Truth in our Speech*, as well as in *Heart*.

Theſe Scripture-Proofs, and the Arguments de-
 duced therefrom, do enervate the whole Force of
 all his Reasonings on theſe Heads.

Befides, as it is manifeſt, that *Oaths* were taken
 on *Religious*, as well as *Terrene or Civil* Accounts ;
 ſo there is no Reason to doubt, but their *Form,*
Subſtance, or *Effence*, was the ſame in both Caſes ;
 a Proof of which we have in one of the Quotations
 aforeſaid, where *Nehemiah* ſays, *I ſhook my Lap, and*
ſaid, So God ſhake out every Man, &c. that performeth
not this Promise, viz. the *Promise* they Swore to do
 according to, *Neh. 5. 12.*

Here is not only an Ample and Perfect *Form* of
 an *Oath*, but alſo the *Imprecation* or *Curſe* expreſſed,
 which is *Effential* thereunto, viz. *God ſhake out, &c.*
To which the Congregation ſaid Amen, ver. 13.

And therefore the Doctrine taught in the *Position*
 and *Testimony* againſt all *Swearing*, which ſeems to
 have been the Occaſion of the preſent Controverſie,
 viz. That thoſe *Words*, or *Forms of Speech*, which
 make an *Oath* in *Worldly* Matters, do not make an
Oath in *Religious* Matters : Or that thoſe *Modes* or
Forms of Speech, uſed by the *Apoſtle*, are not *Oaths*
 in *Religious* Matters, and yet that they are ſo in
Civil or *Terrene* Affairs ; which the *Effayer* hath
 copied after, and endeavoured to improve upon ;

is a manifest Fruit of the *fallen and corrupt Wisdom of Man*, poured into the Church by the subtil Adversary, under the Shew of *Wisdom, Humility, &c.* Col. 2. 18, 23. Which God in his great Mercy graciously purge out, by his most Blessed Spirit, that we may be one again in the Antient Innocency and Simplicity of the Lovely Truth. For our Blessed Saviour hath made no such Distinction, relating to the Subject-matter comprehended under the Prohibition of *Swearing*, as *Religious*, and *Terrene or Civil*; for his Words, *Let your Communication* (Word, or Speech) *be Yea, Yea, Nay, Nay*, are Indefinite, and not determined to one more, than the other.

Moreover, if the Holy Scriptures did not give such a full and plain Confutation of this Notion, as before evidently appears, yet Right Reason alone might convince the *Essayer*; forasmuch as the *Presence of God* is Essential, and hath a necessary Relation to the Matter, (*viz.* The Truth to be spoken) in *Civil* as well as *Religious* Cases: For we can do the one no more without his *Presence*, than the other.

From whence it follows, by undeniable Consequence, that 'tis Lawful to mention his *Presence*, to gain Credit to the *Evidence*, or *Attestation*, in Declaring Truth in *Terrene or Civil Matters*, as well as it is to mention his *Presence* to gain Credit to the *Evidence*, or *Attestation*, in *Religious Matters*; and can be no more a *taking the Name of God in vain*, in the first Case, than in the last. And therefore, as it is agreed by all, that the last is Lawful; it must follow, that the first is Lawful also. But yet to proceed;

By the aforefaid Proofs from Scripture, it appears exceeding plain, that *Oaths* were used by the *Jews* in *Religious*, as well as in *Terrene or Civil* Cases; and that our Lord having forbidden *all Swearing*, 'tis no more Lawful to *Swear* in *Religious*, than in *Terrene or Civil* Cases.

And it being also no less evident, that the *same Words, or Forms of Speech*, which make an *Oath* in one Case, do make an *Oath* in the other; it unavoidably follows, by the Rule of Contraries, that those *Words, or Forms of Speech*, which do not make an *Oath* in one Case, do not make an *Oath* in the other.

Neither must it be here forgotten, that the Apostle Paul, to purge himself from an Evil Imputation, and to beget Credit, with respect to his Honesty touching the very things of this World, such as *Flattery, Silver, Gold, or Apparel*, says, *Neither at any time used we flattering Words, as ye know, nor a Cloke of Covetousness; God is Witness, 1 Thess. 2. 5.* He no more scrupling to say, *God is Witness*, in relation to *Terrene*, than to *Heavenly Things*.

To which I shall add, that I find in the *Treatise of Oaths* itself, the Authors, to beget Credit to their Speech with the Government, or to what they said concerning their Judgment and Attainment, express themselves thus, "*We speak not Boastfully, but with Humility, Before the Great Lord of Heaven and Earth*, p. 13.

Again, "*It is known to Almighty God, and we most heartily desire it may be known and believed by you, (viz. the King and Parliament) that, &c.*" p. 152.

And "*We profess our selves, in the Fear of Almighty God, to be such as have thus learnt Christ Jesus*, p. 155.

So that the Authors of the *Treatise of Oaths* did not think it unlawful, in order to gain Credit to their Speech with the Government, to express the Words *Almighty God, &c.* and therefore consequently did not reckon the *Mentioning the Name of God*, to be *Swearing*, or more than *Yea and Nay*, or coming of *Evil*.

Note, Hence the Lawfulness of the *Present Affirmation* appears, even from the *Treatise of Oaths* it self.

Before

Before I end this Head, I shall take notice of a Passage or two in the *Essay*, that justify the *Affirmation*, or the Use of such Forms of Speech in Terrene Affairs.

"The Question (*says the Essayer*) is not, whether
"or no we cannot, or may not, find a Liberty (even
"from the Lord) upon some Extraordinary Oc-
"casions, to make use of some Serious Attestation
"of his Name or Presence, p. 61.

And again, "It is one thing what a Person may,
"upon some Extraordinary Occasion, find a Dis-
"position or Liberty to use; and another thing to
"be bound to do it, at all Times and Occasions,
p. 67.

Now the admitting of it in Terrene Affairs at any Time, and on any Occasion, is a confessing the thing in it self to be lawful; and not prohibited by Christ; and then, if lawful, and not prohibited by Christ, 'tis no Oath, or more than *Yea* and *Nay*, or Plain *Affirming* and *Denying*.

But that the *Affirmation* is required at all Times, and on all Occasions, the *Essayer* cannot but know is not so; since there are not only Excepted Cases in the *Affirmation-Act* it self in particular, but that the same is only to be used on Extraordinary Occasions, or Cases of Consequence; for of that Nature are all those Cases which come before a Magistrate, consider'd as abstracted from the Common Debates of Ordinary Business, and Conversation between Man and Man, in a private Capacity.

And if, according to the *Essayer*, "we are on all
"Occasions to exhibit to the World the Sufficiency
"and Excellency of the Principle, which God hath
"made known unto us, in giving Evidence, see p. 35.
and that, that is to be done in Words, as well as
Deeds; then, to acknowledge the Attributes of God
in Words, as well as Works, is a Duty, and so far
from Robbing God of his Honour, (notwithstanding
the *Essayer's* bold Assertion to the contrary) that

'tis an Ascribing to him the *Honour due unto his Name*. For, shall we think the Authors of the *Treatise of Oaths* did Rob God of his Honour, in Attesting his Name, to beget Credit to their Speech with the Government, as in the three Instances aforesaid?

S E C T. V.

Wherein the Text, Mat. 5. 33, to 37. is Rescu'd from the mistaken Gloss of the Effayer.

V. 33. **A** Gain, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, thou shalt not forswear thy self, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine Oaths.

34. But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by Heaven, for it is God's Throne:

35. Nor by the Earth, for it is God's Footstool: neither by Jerusalem, for it is the City of the great King.

36. Neither shalt thou Swear by thy Head, because thou canst not make one Hair white or black.

37. But let your Communication (Word or Speech) be, Yea, Yea; Nay, Nay: for whatsoever (is) more than these, cometh of Evil.

Our Lord Jesus Christ here forbids all Swearing; and institutes, or substitutes, Truth-speaking instead thereof.

The first, viz. that he did forbid all Swearing, the Effayer grants; but the last, viz. that he did institute, or substitute, Truth-speaking instead thereof, he denies, saying, "It seems contrary to the whole Tenor of the rest of his Doctrine throughout this Chapter, p. 20. For (says he) "If cometh of Evil must relate to the Truth or Falshood of the Affirming,

“Affirming, &c. it would have been an odd Doctrine to have inculcated in that place, p. 21. And the Reason he gives for it is, Because “Lying—“ was already strictly forbidden by the Old Law, “Levit. 19. 11. p. 20.

Answ. Those that advance New and Unwarrantable Notions are forced to use Strange *Mediums* to support them; and that this is the Case of the *Essayer*, we have a plain Instance before us, in his Exposition of *Mat. 5. 37.* which he would have to be understood, not of the *Truth or Falshood*, but of the *Mode or Manner of Speech*; as tho’ our Saviour were more concerned about the Ceremony, than the Substance; about the Form, than the Truth it self. The *Essayer* to exclude Truth-Speaking from being the Thing here commanded by Christ, pretends it *seems contrary to the whole Tenor of his Doctrine throughout this Chapter.* The Reason he assigns for it, is, *Truth-Speaking was before commanded, and Lying forbidden by the Old Law.* But though it is unquestionably true, that the *latter* was forbidden, and the *former* commanded under the Old Law, yet it doth not therefore follow, that Christ hath not commanded the *one*, and forbidden the *other*. For it is evident, that as the Word *Yea*, signifies *Truth*, see *Mat. 15. 27.* So, *Let your Communication [Word or Speech] be Yea*, is as much as tho’ it had been said, *Let it be Truth*: And therefore since our Communication ought to be Truth; Veracity or Truth-Speaking, and not the Mode or Manner of Speech, is here commanded. *Lying* also, tho’ the *Essayer* would have it otherwise, is no less forbidden by Christ, than it was by the Old Law. For this is a certain Rule in the Interpretation of Scripture, That where a Duty is commanded, the contrary Sin is forbidden, *that is*, by necessary Inference. ’Tis therefore a bold Attempt in the *Essayer*, to call it *Odd Doctrine*, if Christ had prohibited *Lying* in this Place, and savours of an Irreverence that calls

calls for speedy and unfeigned Repentance! What! shall Fallible Man charge the Truth it self with Oddness of Doctrine? And Arraign Him, to whom all Power in Heaven and Earth is committed? But Broachers of new Hypotheses are usually very adventurous, and rather than those Darlings should miscarry, they will stick at nothing for their Preservation.

Again, *Lust* and *Anger*, as they were forbidden by our Saviour in this Chapter, so were they likewise prohibited by the Old Law. For the Law is *Spiritual*, Rom. 7. 14. and teaches not only Words and Actions, but also requires Sanctity in Mind, Will and Affections. The Apostle testifies of himself, saying, *I had not known Sin, but by the Law: For I had not known Lust, except the Law had said, Thou shalt not Covet*, Rom. 7. 7. The Law then forbade *Lust*, no less than it did *Adultery*. And as for *Anger*, that was likewise forbidden, *Thou shalt not revenge, nor bear any Grudge against the Children of thy People*, Levit. 19. 18. The Greek translateth it, *Thou shalt not be Angry*; and the Chaldee, *Thou shalt not keep Enmity*.

More Instances of the like Nature might be given, to shew the *Essayer's* Mistake about the Prohibitions of the Law, and those of *Christ* in this Chapter; were there any occasion for enlarging in a Case so plain and evident, as that, if the *Author* had not, to gain a Point, wilfully shut his Eyes, he might have seen it, and not stumbled, as he hath done, even at Noon-Day. For our Saviour's whole Sermon upon

the Mount, *Mat. 5, 6, 7. Chapters*, "is a Sermon of *Morality*,
 Dr. Edwards's Preacher, p. 61. Edit. 2. 1705. in "and is all of it the *Law of Na-*
 R. Claridge's Apology "ture, except only that one In-
 for Gentile Divinity, "junction, of *not Marrying her*
 p. 35, 36. Edit. 1712. "that is put away for *Fornication*,
 "which *Christ* gives in *Explication* of the *Positive*
 "Law, and design'd it against the *Jews*, who mis-
 "interpreted the *Mosaick Law*.

But

But to proceed, that our Lord did institute or substitute *Truth-Speaking* instead of *Swearing*, ver. 37. the Apostle *James* sufficiently proves; for he having Reference to the Prohibition of *Christ*, respecting Oaths, expresseth himself thus, *Above all things, my Brethren, Swear not, neither by Heaven, neither by the Earth, neither by any other Oath: But let your Yea be Yea, and your Nay, Nay; lest ye fall into Condemnation*, Jam. 5. 12.

Let your Yea be Yea: That is, what you say, is Yea, let it be so; let it be *Truth*, and not a *Lye*. Nothing can be plainer, than that these Words of *James* give a clear Explication of our Lord's Words, and seem to be a Guard, that the Holy Ghost put upon them through this Apostle, against all Perverters of the Doctrine of *Christ*.

And agreeable to the Apostle *James*, *Joseph Pyke*, in his Manuscript, says, "that our Lord did institute *Truth-Speaking* instead of *Swearing*."

R. Barclay (in his *Apology*, p. 554.) says, "Who then needs farther to doubt, but that since *Christ* would have his Disciples attain the highest pitch of Perfection, he abrogated Oaths as a Rudiment of Infirmary, and in place thereof established the Use of *Truth*."

Again, he saith, "Forbidding him (viz. a Christian) to Swear, and on the contrary commanding him to Speak the Truth in all Things, *Apol.* p. 553."

Thomas Ellwood, in his *Sacred History of the New Testament*, Part I. p. 46. says on the Text, "Let your Word, (so, *Abas* properly signifies, especially here, where it ought to have its fullest and most extensive Sense; whereas the word [*Communication*] was put into the Text meerly to restrain the general Prohibition of all Swearing, to Swearing in common Discourse or Talk only: I say, *Let your Word*) *Yea*, be *Yea*, and *Nay* be *Nay*; agreeable to the Apostle *James*, who well knew his

his Master's Mind, *Let your Yea be Yea, and Nay, Nay*; which comes to the same as, *Let your Word be Yea*; and is all one as to say, *Let not your Yea prove Nay, but Speak the Plain Truth, and make good what ye say; that ye may no more For-say your selves, than others (who Swear) For-swear themselves; For whatsoever is more than this, cometh of Evil, or of the Evil One.*

Miles Halhead and Thomas Salthouse, in Answer to the Indictment exhibited against them, and Read to them at the General Sessions of the Peace, holden at the Castle of Exon, in the Year 1655.

"All ye that take your *Oaths*, and give Informations, consider what you do; for because of *Oaths* the Land mourns, and the Lord God will come near to Judgment, and will be a swift Witness against the Lyar, and the False Swearer, that are out of the Doctrine of Christ, who saith, *Swear not at all, but in all your Communication, let your Yea be Yea, and your Nay, Nay; for whatsoever is more, is Evil. The Wounds of an Enemy in the House of a Friend*, p. 64. Edit. 1656.

James Parnel, who died in the Year 1656. in an Epistle to Friends; "If you be called before Magistrates to take an Oath, keep to that which condemns all Oaths, which saith, *Swear not at all, but Testifie the Truth from your Consciences in the Face of all Men*; and so you abide in the Doctrine of Christ, and out of the Condemnation; for, *They that Swear, fall into the Condemnation*, saith the Apostle *James*, Chap. 5. 12. And tho' in the Time of the Law and the Prophets, an Oath, for Confirmation among Men then, was the End of all Strife; but [yet rather] Christ Jesus, the Oath of God, the Fulfilling and End of the Law and the Prophets, saith, *Swear not at all; but let your Yea be Yea, and Nay, Nay; for whatsoever is more, is Evil.* Works, p. 450, 451.

And in *Goliath's Head cut off with his own Sword*,

J. P.

J. P. expounds our Saviour's Words, as before, *Swear not at all, but let your Yea be Yea, and your Nay be Nay; for what is more, is Evil.* Works, p. 405.

After the same manner he interprets them, in his Paper to all Magistrates, Rulers and Officers, who call Men to Swear, and Imprison them, if they will not. Works, p. 470, 471.

In all which Places we have his Sense and Exposition of our Saviour's Words, viz. That *Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay*, do respect *Truth-Speaking, or Testifying Truth from the Conscience, &c.* and not the *Mode or Form of Speech* in Affirming or Denying.

George Fox in a Paper, which, he says, he was moved of the Lord to give forth against Swearing, to the Grand and Petty Juries, thus Paraphraseth upon the Words of Christ, *Let your Yea be Yea, (saith he) and your Nay be Nay, in all your Communications; for whatsoever is more, cometh of Evil.* Journal, p. 180.

Note, He took them not as a *Mode or Form of Speech*, but understood them of *Truth-Speaking* in all our Communications. And for the greater Weight and Authority of the said Paper, wherein this Paraphrase is, he saith, *He was moved of the Lord to give it forth.* And this was at *Lanceston-Assizes*, in the Year 1656.

Another Passage occurs, in *G. Fox's Gospel-Truth Demonstrated, &c.* which for the Suitableness of it to the present Subject, I shall transcribe at large, and make some Observations upon it.

"It is said in *Isaiah* aforesaid, [viz. Chap. 45.]
 "Every Knee shall bow, and every Tongue shall Swear;
 "but the Apostle, that preach'd Christ Jesus, and
 "his Gospel, saith in *Rom. 14.* It is written, *As I live,*
 "saith the Lord, every Knee shall bow to me, and every
 "Tongue shall Confess to God. Now, mark, it is not
 "here, *Every Tongue shall Swear*, as it is written in
 "*Isaiah.* They were to Swear in the Old Time of
 "the Law, but in the Time of the Gospel, they shall
 "Confess;

“ *Confess*; for if the Apostle had said, *every Tongue*
 “ *shall Swear to him*, he had contradicted Christ’s
 “ *Words*, who said, *Swear not at all*; but *every*
 “ *Tongue shall Confess to God*. The Prophet saith,
 “ *every Tongue shall Swear*; but Christ, that is greater
 “ than the Prophet, says, *Swear not at all*. And the
 “ Apostle that preach’d him, says, *Every Tongue shall*
 “ *Confess him and his Gospel*: So it was *Swearing* to
 “ the Lord in the Old Time of the Law, but *Con-*
 “ *fessing* to the Lord in the Time of the Gospel, as
 “ you may see in the Scriptures, p. 473.

Here G. F. shews, that *Confessing* to the Lord in the Time of the Gospel, is appointed instead of *Swearing* to the Lord in the Time of the Law. Now under the Law, the Jews were to *Swear* to the Lord in Cases of Evidence, &c. and therefore under the Gospel, *Christians* are to *Confess* to the Lord in the like Cases.

And that so *Confessing* is no more than *Yea, Yea,* and *Nay, Nay*, G. F.’s Words, p. 480. fully manifest;
 “ If all *Christians* (*saith he*) in *Christendom*, so called,
 “ would so say, and so do, and *Speak the Truth as it*
 “ *is in Jesus*, who is *Truth*, and every Man *Speak*
 “ *Truth with his Neighbour*; This would shew, that
 “ they that profess themselves *Christians*, were *Mem-*
 “ *bers one of another*, and that Christ was their *Head*,
 “ and this [*viz. Speaking the Truth as it is in Jesus*]
 “ would ease them of many Idle Words, and of all
 “ *Oaths*, if they obeyed Christ’s Command, and the
 “ Apostle’s Doctrine, in keeping *Yea, Yea, Nay, Nay,*
 “ in all their Communications.

Obs. 1. *Speaking the Truth as it is in Jesus*, is the Duty of all *Christians* in *Christendom*, so called, and therefore of all *Quakers*.

Obs. 2. As *Speaking the Truth as it is in Jesus*, is the Duty of all *Christians* in *Christendom*, so called, and therefore of all *Quakers*; so it will shew, that they are *Members one of another*, and that Christ is their *Head*.

Obs. 3.

Obs. 3. The *Speaking the Truth as it is in Jesus*, will ease all *Christians in Christendom*, so called, and therefore all *Quakers*, of many Idle Words, and of all Oaths. Mark that, of all Oaths. Therefore *Speaking the Truth as it is in Jesus*, is no Oath.

Obs. 4. The *Speaking the Truth as it is in Jesus*, is the Obeying of Christ's Command, and the Apostle's Doctrine, and keeping *Yea, Yea, Nay, Nay*: And consequently is no more than *Yea, Yea, Nay, Nay*; that is, it is not of an Higher Strain or Nature, but the same for Substance.

Obs. 5. As the *Speaking the Truth as it is in Jesus*, is the Obeying of Christ's Command, and the Apostle's Doctrine, and Keeping *Yea, Yea, Nay, Nay*; so it ought to be observed by all *Christians in Christendom*, so called, and therefore by all *Quakers*, in all their Communications. Mark, in all their Communications; that is, not about Religious Matters only, but also Civil and Terrene.

Obs. 6. The *Speaking the Truth as it is in Jesus*, is Declaring of it in the Presence of Jesus, who is over all God blessed for ever, Rom. 9. 5. The Amen, the Faithful and True Witness, Rev. 3. 14. of the Truth of what we say. For he is a Discerner of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart. Neither is there any Creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked, and opened unto the Eyes of him with whom we have to do, Heb. 4. 12, 13.

Isaac Pennington, in his Treatise, intituled, *The Great Question concerning the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of Swearing under the Gospel*, in the Year 1661. saith, "Christ brings in another thing instead of "Swearing, (a thing far more suitable to the Truth, "Plainness and Simplicity of the Gospel) which is "Confessing the Thing, or *Speaking the Thing in "Truth*, just as it is, either by way of Affirmation "or Denial: But let your Yea be Yea, and Nay, Nay. Works, Part 1. p. 319.

Samuel Fisher, in his Answer to Bishop Gauden, in the

the Year, 1662. saith, "The *Quakers* affirm Christ's
 "Words (*viz.* *Mat.* 5. 37.) must be taken (tho' not
 "in such an Exclusive Latitude, as to forbid more
 "ample Expressions of their Sense, than the bare
 "Syllables, *Yea* and *Nay*; or such an Universality
 "of Command, as *Tyes precisely thereunto*, yet) in
 "such Universality of Command, as limits Chri-
 "stians to *Affirmations* and *Negations*, or SOLEMN
 "ASSEVERATIONS, without any Oath, and in such
 "an Exclusive Latitude, as shuts out *all Swearing*
 "whatsoever.---- But let your Communication be *Yea*,
 "Nay, i. e. be without *all Oaths*; for *what's more*
 "than that, i. e. than SOLEMN ASSEVERATION and
 "NEGATION, is of Evil, p. 91.

Francis Howgil, in his Book, intituled, *The Glory*
of the True Church discovered, in the Year 1662,
 Chap. 7. concerning *Swearing*, saith, "Christ the
 "Everlasting Covenant,—who is the Oath of God,
 "the End of Oaths, and of Strife and Contention,
 "his Doctrine was, *Swear not at all*, *Mat.* 5. 33, 34,
 "35, 36, 37. Neither by the Head, nor Feet, nor
 "Books, nor Gospel, nor any other Thing; but
 "that *Yea* should be *Yea*, and *Nay*, *Nay*, in all things,
Works, p. 428.

John Crook, in *The Cry of the Innocent for Justice*,
 in the Year 1662. saith, "The Apostle *Paul*, *Rom.*
 "14. 11. and *Phil.* 2. 11. referring to the Prophet's
 "Words, *Isai.* 45. 23. where it is said, *Unto me*
 "every Tongue shall Swear, &c. but the Apostle leaveth
 "out the word *Swear*, as unsuitable to Gospel-
 "Times, and inserts instead thereof the word *Con-*
 "fess, saying, *every Tongue shall Confess to God*; as
 "if that which might be *Sworn* to in the Time of
 "the Law, is now only to be confirmed by bare
 "Confession or Negation; and the Reason is, because
 "Gospel-Days are supposed to be attended with
 "clearer Light, and greater Power, that *our Yea*
 "might be *Yea*, and *our Nay*, *Nay*, in all things.
Design of Christianity, p. 190.

Gervase Benson, in his *True Testimony concerning Oaths and Swearing*, written in the Year 1668. expounds Christ's Words thus, *Let your Yea be Yea, and your Nay, Nay*, p. 13.

And in his *Second Testimony*, &c. Printed in the Year 1675. he hath these Words, "Praising God
" in the Spirit, and Confessing unto his Name, Be-
" lieving in Christ Jesus, and Witnessing the Truth,
" according to Christ's Command, *Let your Yea be*
" *Yea, and your Nay, Nay*, p. 15.

Roger Haydock, in a Copy of his Answer tender'd to the Chancellor in the Consistory Court at York, in the Year 1675. being required to Swear, that in his Appealing thither, he had done nothing out of Malice, Answers thus, "It is several Years since I
" could Swear at all; Swearing being expressly con-
" trary to Christ's Command, who said, *Swear not*
" *at all*: But my *Yea* hath been *Yea*, and *Nay, Nay*;
" according to Christ's Doctrine, *Let your Yea be*
" *Yea*; and *Nay, Nay*: But I can very freely speak
" the Truth; and if I say *Nay* to (or deny) the
" Truth; or *Yea*, affirming that for Truth, which
" is a Lye, I desire the same Penalty may be laid
" upon me, which is due to them that Forswear
" themselves. *Collection*, p. 183. Edit. 1700.

The Authors of the *Treatise of Oaths*, contrary to the *Essayer's* Notion of *Yea, Yea*, and *Nay, Nay*, as a Form of Words, say on those Words, viz. "Their
" *YEA* being *YEA*, and their *NAY* being *NAY*, p. 25.

Again, "YEA and NAY---substituted in the Room
" of an OATH,---that is (that) YEA be---*Truly YEA*,
" and---NAY---*Sincerely NAY*, or the *very Truth* of
" the Matter be spoken, which (*say they*) is the Im-
" port of the Words, *Ibid.* p. 22, 23.

Again, "Let your Word be YEA, YEA, and NAY,
" NAY; that is, do not Speak Untruth, &c. *Ibid.*
p. 24.

Again, "Then must our Communication be YEA,
" YEA, and NAY, NAY; that is, we must Live the
" Life,

"Life of Truth, and Speak the Words of Truth," *Ibid.* p. 26.

Again, "Take away Lying, and there remains
"no Ground for Swearing; *Truth-Speaking* comes
"in the room thereof, *Ibid.* p. 27.

These Places, with more that might be mentioned,
shew undeniably the Sense of our Antient Friends,
that Christ instituted or substituted *Truth-Speaking*
instead of *Swearing*; and not that those Words,
whatsoever is more than these, must be understood to
relate to the *Mode or Manner of Speech*, as the *Effayer*
dogmatically asserts; but to the *Truth or Falshood of*
the Speech, which he as peremptorily denies, p. 24.

To which I shall also add the Sense of the follow-
ing Authors, who are cited in that *Treatise*, viz.

JUSTIN MARTYR says, "That we should not *Swear*
"at all, but always *Speak the Truth*. He (that is,
"Christ) hath thus commanded, *Swear not at all*;
"but let your Yea be Yea, and Nay, Nay. *Ibid.*
p. 41.

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS says, in the *Third Book*
of his *Padagogue*, with *Gentianus Hervetus's* Notes
on it, that we "*Speak Truth without an Oath*.
Ibid. p. 48.

ATHANASIUS, on the Passion of Christ, saith,
"The Evangelical Sentence of the Lord is, *Let your*
"*Yea be Yea, and your Nay, Nay*, *Ibid.* p. 54. And
in Answer to this Question, *What then is to be done?*
He saith, "No more, but that our Yea be Yea, and
"our Nay be Nay; and in short, that we do not Lye.
Ibid. p. 55.

Note, The *Effayer*, notwithstanding *Athanasius's*
Words are directly contrary to his Notion of a
Mode or Form of Speech, yet he hath manifestly per-
verted them, p. 33, 36. As he hath also dealt with
that other Saying of *Athanasius*, viz. *We alledge not*
God for Witness for Corruptible Mony's sake; apply-
ing it to, and bringing it against *Solemn Affirming*:
Whereas 'tis plain, *Athanasius* spoke it in reference
to

to Oaths or Swearing only. See *Treatise of Oaths*, p. 34.

GREGORY NYSSENUS, Brother to Basil, on *Cont. Orat.* 13. says, "Swear not at all, neither by Heaven, &c. but let your Yea be Yea, and your Nay, Nay; for whatsoever is more, is of the Devil. Thus (say the Authors of the *Treatise of Oaths*, p. 63, 64.) "do they (*viz.* the Authors they quote) mostly end; which shews how they understood Christ's Words.

ANTIOCHUS of *Palestina*, in his *Pandecks of Scripture*, *Hom.* 62. says, "Let your Yea be Yea, and your Nay, Nay; for whatsoever is more, is of the Evil," *Ibid.* p. 109.

The *Essayer* himself saith, that "after Christ had prohibited Oaths, (he) instituted Yea and Nay, as "a Plain and Simple Affirming or Denying instead thereof, p. 74. And what is a Plain and Simple Affirming or Denying, but *Truth-Speaking*? Or, in the Language of Bishop *Gauden*, speaking of the Practice of the Primitive Christians, *Essay*, p. 76. *The Veracity of their bare Words*?

From all which Quotations, with many more that might be given, it is very evident, that *Truth-Speaking*, and not a *Mode or Form of Speech*, came in the Room of Swearing.

SECT. VI.

Shewing, That nothing is more than Yea and Nay, but True or False Swearing; Agreeable to the Treatise of Oaths, and the Essayer's own Rule.

NOTWITHSTANDING the mighty Bustle the *Essayer* makes, to persuade his Reader, that "Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay, is Christ's Form of Sound Words, to which we are obliged to keep, p. 23. And

And that "the Words (*whatsoever is more than these*)
 " must be understood to relate to the Mode, or
 " Form of Speech, and not to the Truth or Fals-
 " hood of it, p. 24. (That is, that whatsoever is
 more in the Mode, or Form of Speech, than *Yea*,
Yea, and *Nay*, *Nay*, cometh of Evil;) and hath
 highly Aplauded and Exalted the Paper of 1666.
 (and consequently the Authors) for no other Rea-
 son, one would think, but to expose that Paper,
 and himself too, calling the Quotation he makes out
 of it "very Apostolical and Harmonious with our
 " whole System of true Divinity; endeavouring to
 make the *Reader* believe, "that the Apostles preached,
 " and the Martyrs suffered for the Form of Words,
 " *Yea*, *Yea*, or *Nay*, *Nay*; as such, p. 23.

He nevertheless very subtilly shakes off the Sub-
 scribers of the Paper of 1666. and makes the best
 of his way from 'em; but not without giving 'em
 Correction, from a Quotation out of the *Treatise of*
Oaths, which says (on the Words of Christ, *What-*
soever is more than these) "This cannot be intended
 " of more Words than *Yea* or *Nay*, provided they
 " are not of a higher Strain, but of the same De-
 " gree of Speech, importing a Plain Assertion or
 " Denial of a thing; for it is not the Number, but
 " the Nature of the Words spoken, that is here
 " prohibited, p. 30.

But if it cannot be intended of more Words than
Yea and *Nay*, then we are not ty'd to that Form of
 Words. If it be not the *Number*, but *Nature* of the
 Words spoken, that is prohibited, then *Yea*, *Yea*,
Nay, *Nay*, is not the Form of Words we are en-
 joyed, and bound to, by our Saviour.

And that the *Effayer* might not omit to give a
 Lash, both to the Subscribers of the Paper of 1666.
 and himself also, he says, "We cannot suppose the
 " Use of other Words to be unlawful, since there
 " is scarce any Case, but where more Words are re-
 " quired, p. 30.

So that, says he, "the decisive Point, or that op-
"on which the whole Matter turneth, is the *Affirm-*
"ing or *Denying*: Ibid.

Upon which last Words, I joyn Issue with the
Essayer, and say with him, There is no *Medium* be-
tween *Affirming* and *Swearing*. For we either *Affirm*
such a thing to be true, or we *Swear* such a thing to
be true. And this we shall prove,

First, From some of the Authorities cited by the
Essayer.

Secondly, From other Authorities, cited in the
Treatise of Oaths.

Thirdly, From the Concession of the Essayer him-
self, which is very Remarkable.

Fourthly, From the *New Athenians*, no Noble Be-
reans.

Fifthly, And also from the *Treatise of Oaths*.
And

First, From some of the Authorities cited by the Essayer.

EUTHIMIUS ZAGABONUS, (instead of EUTHY-
MIUS ZIGABENUS) as quoted by him, p. 27. says,
"Let your Speech be, when ye affirm, *Yea*; and
"when ye deny, *Nay*; and use only these, for or
"instead of an Oath to Confirmation, and no other
"than *Yea* and *Nay*; what is adjoyned besides these,
"he calls an Oath.

From whence it follows, that there is no *Medium*
between *Yea* and *Nay*, or *Affirming* and *Denying*, and
an Oath; since what is enjoined besides these, (viz.
Yea and *Nay*) he calls an Oath. Again,

JOHANNES PRIMOUS, as he quotes him, p. 22.
saith, "But he that shall well consider the Words
"[at all] going before, and withal (admitting such
"a Sense as this) the Inconsequence of those Words
"[For whatsoever is more than these] will (if I am
"not mistaken) yield with me to their Opinion,
"who have thought the Matter here treated of
"to be, not concerning the Truth of Affirming or
"Denying, but simply concerning not Swearing.

So that his Sense is, that the Words [*Whatsoever is more*] is meant simply of *not Swearing*, or *Swear not at all*; that is, that nothing is *more* than *Yea* and *Nay*, or *Affirming* and *Denying*, but *Swearing*; and that *Swearing* is that *more*, which cometh of Evil; and so consequently no *Medium* between them.

Secondly, *From some of the Authorities cited in the Treatise of Oaths.*

“To Swear (says *Chrysostom*, *Hom. 5.*) is of the Devil; seeing Christ saith, *What is more* (than *Yea*, &c.) is of Evil, p. 10, 70.

Whereby it appears, he understood *More than these*, to relate to nothing else but an *Oath*; and so consequently that there is no *Medium* between them.

And the same Author on *Mat. Hom. 17.* asked this Question, “*What then shall we say is beyond Yea and Nay?*” Answer, “Without doubt an *Oath*. *Ibid.* p. 74.

And that *that only*, he understood to be the *more* intended, is plain from his Words following, *viz.* “Now that is superfluous, which is added needlessly, and too much, which surely is an *Oath*. *Ibid.*

Again, *Erasmus* on *Mat. 5.* says, “If there be any more besides these, (*viz.* *Yea* and *Nay*) it must needs come of Evil and Sin: For he that Swareth, &c. *Ibid.* p. 150.

From which 'tis manifest, that *Erasmus* understood, *Whatsoever is more than these*, to be only meant an *Oath*; and did not allow any *Medium* between *Yea* and *Nay*, or *Affirming* and *Denying*, and an *Oath*.

Thirdly, *From the Concession of the Essayer himself, which is very Remarkable.*

He says, “The next Degree, or Manner of Speech, (to that of plain *Affirmation* and *Negation*, as it appears he means, by comparing his Second and Third Paragraph in Page 91.) “which is but an
“*Aff-*

“*Asseveration* (including the Name of God) was
 “commanded by the Lord, as the proper Oath un-
 “der the Law.

And says he, in a *Syllogism*, that we may see what
 Skill he has in *Logick*, (and shall be enquired into
 hereafter) “The Oaths which Christ prohibited
 “under the Gospel, are such and such like Oaths,
 “which God permitted and commanded under the
 “Law :

“But the Oaths which God permitted and com-
 “manded under the Law, were Solemn *Assevera-*
 “tions ;

“Therefore Solemn *Asseverations* are prohibited
 “by Christ under the Gospel, p. 88.

For, saith he, tho’ erroneously) “The next De-
 “gree or Manner of Speech [viz. to a Plain *Affir-*
mation and Negation] “is but an *Asseveration* (in-
 “cluding the Name of God) which was commanded
 “by the Lord as the Proper Oath under the Law ;
 “and is likewise prohibited by Christ under the
 “Gospel, p. 91.

Now these Quotations shew plainly enough, that
 the *Essayer* makes no *Medium* between *Yea* and *Nay*,
 or *Affirmation* and *Negation*, (as he words it) and
 an *Oath* ; and that he takes an *Oath* to be the next
 Degree or Manner of Speech to *Yea* or *Affirmation*.
 But then, that he is mistaken, in taking that to be
 an *Oath*, which is not so, is before demonstrated in
 the Definition of an *Oath*, Sect. II.

Fourthly, *From the New Athenians no Noble Bereans.*

The Paper bearing this Title, was publish’d in
 the Year 1692. by *Friends* as a Body of People, and
 written, as ’tis reputed, by *W. Penn*, in Answer to the
Athenian Mercury ; in one of which Papers we were
 attack’d, Respecting our Testimony against all *Swear-*
ing ; to which, among other things, this Answer was
 return’d, viz.

“But you think you pinch us, by urging the Text
 “upon us Literally, (i. e. *Let your Communication be*

Yea, Yea; Nay, Nay: for *whatsoever is more than these, cometh of Evil*) "which, alas, is your Mistake; "for so that we do not Swear, we answer that Pre-
"cept, tho' by other Words than Yea and Nay.

This fully manifests our Sense, as a People at that time, (treating, *ex professo*, as the *Essayer* calls it, on the Point now in Controversie) that we believed then, that *Nothing* was forbidden in this Text but an *Oath*; and that all Speech, which did not amount to an *Oath*, tho' in other Words than Yea and Nay, was not more than Yea and Nay; and so consequently no *Medium* between Yea and Nay, or *Affirming* and *Denying*, and an *Oath*.

And this may be truly called the *Ancient Principle* of us as a Society, on this Head; and the contrary Opinion may very justly be pronounced a *Novelty*.

Fifthly, *And also from the Treatise of Oaths it self.*

This *Treatise* may, on this Occasion, be very well called the *Essayer's Beloved Book*; since he hath made it his mighty Magazine, and borrow'd from it near all his Quotations. But 'tis a very great Mark of his manifest Disingenuity, to "scrue any particular "Passage in it up to such a Note or Accent (*to use his own Words*, p. 55.) "as will spoil the Harmony "of the whole System.

He should (had he been Candid) have thought on his own Words, that when "any doubtful Express-
"sions happen to be let fall, which may want an
"Explanation, or Exception; the *Reader* is not pre-
"sently to make his own Comment upon it, but
"carefully to seek if the Author have not elsewhere
"explain'd himself; and if he hath in any one part
"of his Writings, laid down the Exception, or Li-
"mitation, &c. upon the same Subject, that ought
"to be extended as a *Salvo*, at all Times and Places,
"where the Position, &c. is asserted; as being really
"implied, tho' not expressed therein, p. 49.

And

And if this Rule had govern'd in his own Breast, he might have found such Limitations, or Explanations, in the said *Treatise of Oaths*, as would have taught him a fair and equal Conduct.

For it cannot be supposed, that the Explanatory Words, which are immediately subjoyned to those he cites in p. 30. out of p. 23. of that *Treatise*, could escape his Notice. And then how Partial must he be to his own Conscience, to lay that down for a Righteous and Equitable Rule, which he did not think fit to govern himself by?

The Authors of the said *Treatise* being (*ex professo*, to use the *Essayer's* Phrase again) treating on the Words of Christ, (*viz. Whatsoever is more than these, (i. e. Yea, Yea, Nay, Nay) cometh of Evil*) say, "This cannot be intended of more Words than
" *Yea* and *Nay*, provided they are not of a higher
" Strain, but of the same Degree of Speech, im-
" porting a plain Assertion or Denial of a thing;
" for it is not the *Number*, but the *Nature* of the
" Words spoken, that is here prohibited.

Thus far the *Essayer* goes: From which (by the Rule of Contraries) he draws a Conclusion, in a strange *Logical* Strain, p. 31. and proceeds upon it with Instances, and Inferences, against the *Affirmation*, for near two Pages: But how unjustly, will presently appear. For the very next Words to those by him quoted, as above, and which are joyned to them, without so much as a Period, are as follow, *viz.*

" Nor can it be understood of *Perjury*; for every
" Body knows that to be Evil in it self, which is
" more than that which cometh of, or because of
" Evil: Therefore it must be understood as well of
" *Swearing*, as of *Eor swearing*, which is not Evil in
" it self, yet cometh of, or by reason of Evil in the
" World: Nor is there any thing *more than Yea* and
" *Nay*, besides *Perjury*, which can be intended, but
" an *Oath*; and therefore that was intended, p. 23.

Now

Now what can be plainer, than that, here is a full and clear Explanation of the Authors Sense of the Words of Christ, *Whatsoever is More than these*, (i. e. *Yea and Nay*) is an *Oath*? and that *Nothing*, no *Words*, no *Form of Speech* whatsoever, is of a higher Strain and Nature than *Yea and Nay*, but an *Oath*, viz. a *True or False Oath*? And so consequently, that there is no *Medium*, or *Middle Mode*, or *Form of Speech*, between *Swearing*, and *Yea and Nay*, or *Affirming* and *Denying*.

Again, in the same Page it is said, "If your *Yea* be *Yea*, it is enough; if your *Nay* be *Nay*, it is sufficient: For Christians ought not to *Swear*; if they do, they fall into *Condemnation*, in that they break their Master's Command, who hath told them, that *whatsoever is more than Yea or Nay, cometh of Evil*."

So that from hence it appears also, that the Authors of the *Treatise of Oaths* admit of no *Medium*, or *Middle Thing*, between *Yea or Nay*, and an *Oath*. For their Sense is, if it be *more than Yea or Nay*, it is an *Oath*; and so on the contrary, if it be not an *Oath*, then 'tis not *more than Yea and Nay*.

Yet again, let us hear them farther in the same Page, "Christ (*say they*) doth not only prohibit Evil it self, but that which is Evil by Superfluity, to Evangelical Sincerity; and that *Swearing* is, --- where-ever *Yea* is *Yea*, and *Nay* is *Nay*. That is, where-ever *Truth-Speaking* is, there is no occasion of the Superfluity of *Swearing*. *Swearing* only they understand to be that Superfluity. And they go on, and say, "If what is *more than Yea and Nay*, cometh of Evil, then because any *Swearing*, as well as *For-swearing*, is *more than Yea and Nay*, it follows, that any *Swearing* cometh of Evil, and therefore ought to be rejected of Christians."

Here again we see, that by *More than Yea and Nay*, they understand nothing to be intended, but *True or False Swearing*; and so consequently no
Medium

Medium between *Swearing*, and *Yea* and *Nay*; they taking nothing to be *Superfluous*, or over and above *Yea* and *Nay*, but *True* or *False Swearing*.

Moreover, in the same *Treatise*, p. 24. they say, "Let your Word be *Yea*, *Yea*, and *Nay*, *Nay*; that is, do not *Speak Untruth*; for that is Evil: Don't *Swear*; for that comes of Evil. To conclude, (say they) "People *Swear*, to the End they may *Speak Truth*; Christ would have Men *Speak Truth*, to the End they might not *Swear*."

From all which Quotations out of the *Treatise of Oaths*, 'tis evident, that the Authors had found but two ways of giving Evidence, viz. either by an *Oath*, which is prohibited; or by *Yea* and *Nay*, or *Truth-Speaking*, without an *Oath*, which is commanded; and never dream'd of the *Chimera* of a *Medium* between those two.

And therefore all the Expressions in the said *Treatise*, against a higher Strain of Speech; Rising higher in Evidence, than bare Affirming and Denying; Scaring Asseverations; Expedients; Extraordinary Expedients; Presumptuous Tempting of God, to summon Him as Witness, not only to our Terrene, but Trivial Businesses, as quoted by the *Essayer*, p. 24, 30, 38, 44, 47, &c. cannot, without Injustice to the Authors, be construed to be intended against any thing but *Swearing*.

'Tis to do Violence to the *Essayer's* Rule, to understand the Authors otherwise: For, says he, (as before quoted, p. 49.) "The Reader is not present-ly to make his own Comment upon it, (as he himself hath done)" but carefully to seek if the Author "hath not elsewhere explain'd himself. And the Authors of the *Treatise of Oaths* having elsewhere explain'd themselves, as above, it follows that the *Essayer* hath been a palpable Transgressor of his own Rule.

And thus I have made it apparent, that *Nothing* is forbidden in the Text but *Swearing*, and that
Nothing

Nothing is more than *Yea* and *Nay*, but *True* or *False Swearing*; and have rescu'd the Sense of the Authors of the *Treatise of Oaths* from that Violence the *Essayer* would put upon it, by endeavouring to make that *Treatise* speak against *Solemn Affirming*, which was written and intended against *Swearing*; and which *Treatise* expressly approves of *Solemn Affirming*, or our *Solemn Yea* or *Nay*, p. 166. and of the Offers that had been then made by our *Friends*, of *Forms* of Words, in which the *Name of God* was mentioned, to be accepted from us by the Government, *instead of an Oath*, which they had a direct Relation to in p. 3. saying, *We have again and again tendered our Solemn Yea and Nay.*

To which I shall yet farther add, that the Apostle *James*, in direct Relation to the Prohibition of *Christ*, leaves out, *Whatsoever is more than these*; and puts, *Neither by any other Oath*, in the stead thereof; and this being done by the Direction of the Holy Ghost, shews, that we are to understand by the Words of *Christ*, *Whatsoever is more than these*, to be meant only of all *Oaths*, as by comparing *Mat. 5. 37.* with *Jam. 5. 12.* will evidently appear to a Judicious Reader.

Wherefore, having proved from the Scriptures what an Oath in it self is, *viz.* a Binding the Soul to God with a Bond, therein Covenanting to Speak or Act in Truth, by an Imprecation, Curse, or Penalty, to be inflicted by God upon the Covenant-Breaker; that the *Essayer* hath, in the main, agreed to the said Definition; that he is Erroneous and Antiscriptural in teaching, that the same *Modes* or *Forms of Speech*, which do not make an Oath in *Religious*, do nevertheless make an Oath in *Civil Matters*; that the present *Solemn Affirmation* is no Oath; that our Lord did not Institute or Substitute a *Mode* or *Form of Speech*, instead of *Swearing*, but only *Truth-Speaking*, and that nothing but *True* or *False Swearing* is forbidden in *Mat. 5. 33, to 37.* I shall proceed to the next Section.

S E C T. VII.

Shewing the Errors and Inconsistencies, which the Essayer would lead his Readers into, about an Oath: And yet such is the Force of Truth, that he cannot but (even against himself) Confess and Acknowledge, in the main, the true Definition of an Oath, &c.

ONE while 'tis impossible to Form a true Judgment of an Oath: His Words are, p. 9. "So that my adducing those several Instances of different Forms heretofore used, is not intended to draw a Conclusion from thence, what is an Oath; but rather to shew the Impossibility of Forming a true Judgment thereupon."

And yet anon he says, "An Affeuration (including the Name of God) was commanded by the Lord, as the Proper Oath under the Law, p. 91.

By and by, "The Apostle's Attesting the Name of God (in the immediate Openings of the Word of Life) *Let it have been done in what Form soever,* cannot be deemed an Oath, see p. 46.

"The Falsity might be, in that they were not Sensible the Lord lived, which (says the Essayer) even while Swearing was in use, seemed to have been an ESSENTIAL PROPERTY to a Right OATH, p. 5.

Here the Feeling, or Sense that the Lord lived, is made an Essential Property to a Right Oath; but there the Apostle's Attesting the Name of God, in such a Sense or Feeling of him, *let it have been done in what Form soever,* cannot be deemed an Oath. See what palpable Contradictions Men run into, when

they wander from Truth, in the Wilderness of their own Imaginations.

Again, another while he says, "An Oath is not, nor cannot be confined to a certain Number of Words, or Form of Speech, so as to receive its Definition therefrom, p. 8, 9.

And yet he confesses, "that when they Imprecated, or called upon God, &c. as in *David's Case*, 2 Sam. 3. 35. (viz. *David Swore*, saying, *So do God to me, and more also, if I taste Bread, or ought else, till the Sun be down*) "It is plain, they desired God to deal with them, as they perform'd their Words or Promises, which (*says the Effayer*) "is a very Ample and Perfect FORM of an OATH, p. 13. And this, say I, is, in the main, a true Definition of an Oath.

Was not the *Effayer* well imploy'd, to write so many Sheets of Paper against all *Swearing*; and yet, while he was upon it, not stick to tell his *Reader*, that it was not intended to draw a Conclusion from thence, what is an Oath? And how will he account for daring to render our Saviour so Preposterous, and guilty of such a Paradox, as to forbid that, which 'tis Impossible to Form a true Judgment upon?

Behold! the Glorious State of Man, in the Purity this Bold Author pretends to, where "no Diffidence is, where Lying and Deceit have no place; but the Speech pure and veracious! For in that State (in the Openings of the Word of Life) to Attest the Name of God, let it have been done in what Form soever, cannot (according to the *Effayer*) be deemed an Oath. No, not by the Heavens above, and Earth beneath, and by the God that made them. No, not by, *So help me God*, kissing the Bible, and desiring all the Judgments and Curses therein contained to come upon us, and all the Blessings therein contained to be with-held from us, if we speak not the Truth: Nay, (as in *Sweden* and *Denmark*) Let the Judgments of God come on us,

us, and our Posterity, to the Tenth Generation, if, &c. None of these, it seems, are Oaths, if the Friend is moved of the Lord so to speak!

Was there ever a more manifest *Symptom of Rantism*, in any Age, and among any People, than has now appear'd, under the Pretence of a greater Degree of Brightness and Glory, and consequently of a Veracity suitable thereunto?

Behold the Absurdity that accompanies this New Notion, advanc'd as a Standard of Truth and Righteousness, not only to this Age, but Generations to come!

However, to be just to the *Essayer*, after that he had for a while wander'd about in the Wilderness of his own Imaginations, and in the Darkeness and Uncertainty of what makes an *Oath*, at last happen'd on some Glimmerings of *Light*, which produced this true Acknowledgment, *viz.* "It is plain they desired God to deal with them, as they performed their Words or Promises; which (*says he*) "is an Ample and Perfect FORM of an OATH, p. 13.

Yet so great is his Unhappiness, that in this *Light* of Truth he continues not long, but soon rambles again into the Wilderness of his Carnal Reasoning: For tho' he admits, p. 18. that there is no *Imprecation* in these Words, *The Lord liveth*, and that the same is but a *Plain Asseveration*, p. 87. yet he would have it, that *Holy Writ hath deemed it an Oath*.

But this, I have shewn before, is his great Mistake; and that we have only his *Ipsé dixit* for it, without any Proof. And indeed saying, *The Lord liveth*, being, as he confesses, but a *Plain Asseveration*, or Plain Earnest Affirming, without any *Imprecation*, or the Word *Oath* or *Swear*, which implies it, I positively deny the same to be *Swearing*: And yet am not backward to affirm, with the *Treatise of Oaths*, that "the Omnipresency of God, rightly understood, "shews the Usefulness of an *Oath*, and is with us

" a good Argument against *Swearing* : For what
 " need is there of that Man's being aw'd into true
 " Evidence, by such sort of Attestations and Im-
 " precations, as make up the common Form of
 " Oaths, who knows God to be always present, to
 " Reside and Preside in his Soul, according to that
 " New and Everlasting Covenant which he hath
 " made, that his People should be his Temple, that he
 " would dwell in them, and walk in them? Did the
 " Children of Men know the Power, Glory and
 " Majesty of God, whom the Apostle preach'd,
 " Acts 17. 28. Nigh to the Athenians, and declared
 " to the Ephesians, Chap. 4. 6. to be Father of all,
 " above all, through all, and in them all; there would
 " be no Oaths, and but few Words, and those utter'd
 " with Reverence and Truth, p. 16, 17.

Is it not then a plain Indication, that the *Essayer*
 is one of those that are Ignorant of the *Glory, Power,*
 and *Omnipresency* of God, (for a Christian, after
 the New Covenant, knows God to be always pre-
 sent, to Reside and Preside in his Soul) in his
 making the *Present Affirmation*, which is but *Truth-*
Speaking, and no *Oath*, an *Extrinsick Medium*, (as
 he does an *Oath*) to Oblige us to Speak Truth;
 when we have, by a Multitude of Authorities,
 proved, there's no such *Medium* in Nature between
Swearing and *Truth-Speaking*?

Besides, by the above Quotation, out of the *Trea-*
tise of Oaths, it's very manifest, that the *Authors*
 understood the common Form of *Oaths* to be made
 of *Attestations* and *Imprecations* conjoyn'd : Nor can
 we find any Instance in those called *Sacred* or *Profane*
Authors, without it, either Expressed or Under-
 stood, before *John Fisher's Position*, and this *Essayer*
 came forth with this New Testimony.

And that this is agreeable to the *Treatise of Oaths*,
 is very plain; for in p. 101, 102. the *Authors* shew,
 from Bp. *Sanderson*, that, " that [*viz.* an *Affirma-*
tion] " is sometimes used in the Form of an *Oath*
 " which

“ which is no Oath; and so he defendeth *Joseph* from
 “ breaking God’s Command; that is, not to have
 “ Sworn so, &c. but to have used an Affeuration,
 “ as if he had said, *as sure as Pharaoh liveth, ye are*
 “ *Spies*, (To which they added) So may *Paul* be de-
 “ fended against the breaking of Christ’s Com-
 “ mand.

With which also agrees *Basilus Magnus*, who says,
Ibid. p. 61. “ Now there are some Speeches which have
 “ the Forms (or *Appearances*) of Oaths, and yet are
 “ no Oaths at all, but rather Remedies to Perswade;
 “ as *Joseph*, to make the *Egyptians* familiar with
 “ him, (is said to have) “ Swore by the *Health of*
 “ *Pharaoh* (פֶּרַע הַחַיִּים true *Pharaoh*.) And the Apostle,
 “ 1 *Cor.* 15. 13. willing to shew his Love to the *Co-*
 “ *rinthians*, said, *By the Glorifying of you, which I have*
 “ *in Christ Jesus, our Lord*: For (says *Basilus*) he did
 “ not depart from the Doctrine of the Gospel, &c.

And of this Mind, it seems, was *Gregory Nazianzen*, who says, as cited in the said *Treatise*, p. 65.
 “ *God is Witness*, and *God Knower*; those words are
 “ not an Oath, but a certain Affeuration.

These Authorities, and more that might be men-
 tioned, to the same purpose, out of that *Treatise*,
 the *Essayer* hath thought fit to let slip through his
 Fingers; and yet looks up very demurely, and tells us,
 “ That no Author’s Judgment (should) be determined
 “ (in any Particular Point of Doctrine) from any
 “ Transient Passages; but rather Collected from
 “ the general Drift and Tendency of such of his
 “ Writings, where he Treats (*ex professo*) of that
 “ very Subject. In which likewise this Rule is to be
 “ Observed, That if in the Treating thereof, any
 “ doubtful Expressions happen to be let fall, which
 “ may want an Explanation, or Exception; the
 “ Reader is not presently to make his own Com-
 “ ment upon it, but carefully to seek if the Author
 “ have not elsewhere Explained himself, p. 49.

Could a Stranger, who reads this grave Sentence,
 and

and compares it with the rest of the Book, think any other, but that the *Effayer* designed it for a *Pious Fraud*? For whosoever hath read the *Treatise of Oaths*, with Consideration, must needs be very sensible, that it was written only against all *Swearing*, and not to plead for the Substitution of the Words *Yea, Yea, Nay, Nay*, as the *Mode* or *Form* of Speech in lieu of an *Oath*; since such a Doctrine is no where to be found in that *Treatise*; but on the contrary, those *Authors* declared there, as I here do, that *Truth-Speaking* is the *Yea* and *Nay* which Christ substituted in the Room of *Swearing*: As is before proved, *Seet. V.*

And notwithstanding the *Effayer* hath declared all *Extrinsic Mediums*, to give a Sanction, or gain Credit to Speech, are *Oaths*, or Prohibited by Christ; yet he himself in p. 73. falls into an *Extrinsic*, with a Witness, saying, *Surely, Yea*, p. 73.

They (*viz. the Dissatisfied*) know also where the Head, (or at least one of the Principal Heads) of their Party, said, *Let me for ever be reckon'd a Villain, if it be not so*; or to that purpose: And where it was, that the same *Friend* called on another, to *Speak upon his Honour*.

But let us hear the *Effayer* yet farther; "Oaths, (*saith he*) "are the *Shadow* and *Type*; The Verity of "God is the *Antitype*; where this is Witnessed, the "using the Outward *Medium*, (*viz. an Oath*) is not "only Unlawful, but the Substituting of any other " (supposing it were wholly another) *Medium* in its "stead, ---- is likewise condemnable; since it is im- "proper for one *Sign, Figure, or Medium*, to give "Place to another, but to the *Substance* it self; "which, by being stript of all *Mediums*, becomes "more Perspicuous and Transparent, answerable "to the Brightness of the Gospel-Dispensation.

"But notwithstanding it is so, yet here we see "the *Affirmation* is intended as another (*if it be ano- "ther*) *Medium* instead of an *Oath*, p. 72.

We perceive he makes here, *Shadow, Type, Sign, Figure, Medium, and Oath*, to be of the same import; and when he hath thus muster'd his Forces, he then declares the *Affirmation*, another (*if it be another*) *Medium*. But having before spoken of *Type, Shadow, Sign, Figure, Medium* and *Oath*, as Synonymous; what occasion was there for his saying, *If it be another*; but to give us a Specimen of that Rectitude, which accompanies his *Pretended Gospel-Brightness*; who is "not to conceal the Goodness of God, -- but to let "the World know he is healed? p. 13.

For whoever shall read and consider his 72, 73, and 74 Pages, if he is not well appriz'd of the Qualifications of the *Essayer*, and his *Party*; 'tis no wonder if he shall innocently conclude, that certainly these Men are as they say, *Healed of Deceit, and a Lying Tongue, &c.* And in short, that they are Extraordinary Christians, arrived to such a Degree of Perfection, that their Conversation and Principle are such, as need nothing else, as a *Medium* to gain Credit, or give a Sanction to their Words, but their own *Ipse dixit's*: No, not so much as *Verily, verily*; or, *I assure thee*; or, *I Promise to Speak the Truth*; or, *I Solemnly Declare and Affirm*; or, *Believe me, it is so*: For all these, and many more such Phrases, in common Usage, are (as I conceive, they understand them) Extrinsic, and as such, *Sinful Mediums* with Men of their Refined Character.

"And this likewise (*says the Essayer*) it seems, "was the Judgment of

Alexander Parker,

George Whitehead,

Stephen Crisp,

William Mead,

Gerrard Roberts,

William Welsh,

Samuel Newton,

Thomas Heart,

John Osgood,

James Claypool,

Thomas Rudyard,

Richard Richardson,

And WILLIAM PENN,

"In the Year 1675. as may be fairly gather'd from "the following Quotation; wherein he says, (Quo-
ting

ting the *Treatise of Oaths*, p. 13. but should be 14.)
 " How is it possible for Men to recover that Ancient
 " Confidence, which good Men reposed in one ano-
 " ther, if some don't lead the way, and hold forth
 " to the World, a Principle and Conversation be-
 " yond the Necessity of such Extraordinary Expe-
 " dients, p. 74.

Now, says the *Essayer*, " These things, are ap-
 " parent and clear, without any strained Conse-
 " quences, &c. p. 74.

Compassion to the Creatures of God, who are
 liable to be beguiled with fine Words and fair
 Speeches, moves me to switch this guileful *Essayer*
 out of his Curles; as well as to rescue those Ancient
 Friends above-named out of the Hands of their *Dis-*
ingenuous; tho' *Preterded* Friend and Admirer.

The *Essayer* professes, that without any strained
 Consequences, it is apparent, that in the Year
 1675. those Friends were of the Judgment, that
 all such *Extraordinary Expedients* (*viz.* such as the
Affirmation) should be laid aside and denied, as Po-
 tions only fit for Sick Souls, such as those who are
 for the *Affirmation*. But as for him, he hath no need
 of such *Extraordinary Expedients*, his own *Veracity*,
 it seems, is sufficient: Hear him else, and try him,
 for he writes his own Sense, and what, as he says,
 was the Judgment of *Alexander Parker*, &c. and that
 without any strained Consequences too, as things ap-
 parent and clear.

But behold the Insincerity of the *Essayer*, and
 how grossly he hath abused those *Ancient Friends*!
 For Proof whereof, we need go no farther than
 the 13th Page of the *Treatise of Oaths*, wherein the
Authors thereof have these Expressions, " He that
 " fears *Untruth*, needs not Swear, because he will not
 " Lye, to prevent which Men exact *Swearing*: And
 " he that doth not fear telling *Untruth*, what is his
 " *Oath* worth? He that makes no Conscience of
 " that Law that forbids *Lying*, will he make any
 " Con-

“ Conscience of *Forswearing* ? *Veracity* is the best
 “ Security, and *Truth-Speaking* the Noblest Tye, and
 “ Firmest Testimony that can be given. This we
 “ declare to you (*viz. the King and Parliament*) to
 “ be both our Judgment and Attainment : We
 “ speak not Boastingly, but with Humility Before
 “ the GREAT LORD of Heaven and Earth.

Here is an *Affirmation* with the Name of God men-
 tion'd in it ; which being what those Friends used
 themselves, cannot be one of the *Extraordinary*
Expedients, that they complain'd of, and testified
 against. To which they add,

“ He hath taught us to speak the Truth, &c.
 “ without an Oath ; and to abhor *Lying* as much
 “ as *Pervary* : So that for us to *Swear*, were to take
 “ his Holy Name in vain.

And to use the Name of GOD in an Oath, an
 Oath being prohibited, is to take it in vain ; as
Suarez teacheth, saying, “ The Name of God is
 “ taken in vain, as often as it is taken to Swear,
Treatise of Oaths, p. 142.

And *Drathmarus*, whom the *Essayer* picks a part
 out of, from the said *Treatise*, and places it in the
 Front of his Book, tho' he was not so honest as to
 quote the Page, lest Perhaps his Reader should see the
 Fraud he would put upon him, 'tis evident, intends
 no other, than using the Name of God in an Oath ; see
Treatise of Oaths, p. 114. which manifests his Per-
 version of him : But to use it in *Truth-Speaking*,
 which Christ hath Substituted in the Room of
Swearing, as those Friends used it in their *Affirma-*
tion, and as we use it in the *Present Affirmation*, on
 good Occasions, is not to take it in vain, nor fly to
Extraordinary Expedients.

Again, say they, “ *Christian Fathers, Martyrs and*
 “ *Doctors, &c.* have had this Sense of the Rise, and
 “ Use of Oaths.

All which Passages in this 13th Page of the *Treat-*
ise of Oaths, make it exceeding plain, that the Au-

thors intended by the Words, *Extraordinary Expedients*, p. 14. the *Oaths* and *Swearing* they had been treating of, p. 13. Neither is there, throughout this Page, (no, nor the whole *Treatise*) the least Appearance of any Notion that they had of a *Medium* between *Truth-Speaking* and *Swearing*; so that of necessity, by *Extraordinary Expedients*, they must intend *Oaths*.

How apparent therefore is the Injury, that the *Essayer* has done to *Alexander Parker*, *George Whitehead*, &c. in bringing them in for Witnesses against the *Present Affirmation*, and perverting their Words, *Extraordinary Expedients*, as if intended against *Solemn Affirming*, when they were designed only against *Oaths* and *Swearing*?

Is this his *Evangelical Brightness*? Is this his *Apparent and Clear*, without any strained Consequences? Is this to have the *Speech* pure and veracious? Let him blush, and be ashamed!

The *Essayer* teaches, “where there is not Deceit
“on the one side, nor Diffidence on the other, no
“more than a bare Affirming, or Answer to a
“Question in *Tea*, is necessary, for the Discovery
“of the Truth, in a *Bill of Entry*, or *Invoice of Goods*;
see p. 31.

But then turn the Tables, and behold the other side of their Doctrine! and where there is Deceit on the one side, and Diffidence on the other, tell me how the Truth of the Invoice or Entry shall be discover'd, without a *Solemn Affirmation*.

Whatever *Sincerity* there may be on the one side, we are sure there's *Diffidence* on the other; and unless the one side be free from *Deceit*, and the other also free from *Diffidence*, his Proposal comes to nothing; and so is only Building a Castle in the Air, both for the Present and Future Ages to gaze at, but never likely to be the better for, according to this *New Plan* of the *Essayer*.

And that there's Reason for *Diffidence* on the other side, is very notorious, since Frauds are almost daily attempted; and by the Management of the *Essayer*, I have no Reason to think he excels in Veracity. His saying, *where there is not Deceit on the one side, nor Diffidence on the other*, is as supposing there may be *Deceit* on the one side, and *Diffidence* on the other; and therefore a Solemn Testimony ought to be used, to purge the one, and satisfy the other.

The *Essayer* tells us, p. 79. The Prince of Orange granted the *Menists*, "that their *Yea* passing for an Oath, the Transgressors thereof should be punish'd as Oath-Breakers.

And then he remarks, p. 80. that "they (the *Menists*) "solicited for their bare *Yea* and *Nay* to pass, &c. And "that the Government granted that their *Yea* and *Nay* should be so accepted. Adding a little lower, "How happy they were in strictly adhering "to the Simplicity of the Holy Text in their first Solicitation? Which Remarks of his, a mean Reader must know, were designed to cast a Reflection on the *First Solicitors* for Ease in the Case of Oaths, as well as on the *Affirmation*, which the Government hath granted us.

To which I answer, That 'tis well for the *Essayer*, if he makes Conscience of what he says, or affirms; for 'tis very apparent, he hath not told the whole Truth in this *Dutch Story*. For the *Treatise of Oaths*, p. 165. says, That the *Menists* were obliged so to declare, as that a Certificate of their *Affirmation* might run in these Words, viz. "These are to Certifie, &c. That A. B. hath before us Solemnly Affirmed "and Declared, &c. And the Authors of the *Treatise of Oaths* call what these *Menists* took, the Solemn Affirmation. Ibid.

Now, how is it possible for any Magistrates, or Custom-House Officers, &c. truly to Certifie, That

A. B. hath before them Solemnly Affirmed and Declared, &c. when he only said *Yea* or *Nay*? And how will this Learned *Essayer* be able to make those *Monosyllables* answer every Occasion? To me it seems a *Paradox*; and the *Essayer*, in effect, confesses as much, who says, p. 30. "There is scarce
"any Case, but where more Words are required."

Besides, it doth not appear, by any thing he hath produced, that the *Menists* did solicit the Government for their *Bare Yea* and *Nay*, or for *Yea* and *Nay*, as a *Form of Words*; but on the contrary, the *Yea* or *Affirmation* they petition'd for, pass'd with the Government for an *Oath*. And I ask the *Essayer*, whether he will accept of a *Yea* from the Government, if that *Yea* shall be Enacted to Pass for an *Oath*? Will that make his *Friends* easie, to have their *Yea* made an *Oath*, or called so in Law, who are so uneasie with what the Law calls only a *Solemn Affirmation*?

I must also take notice, that the *Essayer* says, "The Holy Scriptures, which are the highest External Authority that can be produced, inform us, that Plain Asseverations have been accounted Oaths; ----- That *The Lord liveth*, which is but a Plain Asseveration, was the Legal Oath appointed to be made use of by the Lord himself, p. 87.

To which I Answer, His Mistake herein is very Notorious; for as those Texts he quotes out of *Jeremiah*, p. 88. do not prove his Assertion, viz. That a Plain Asseveration was the Legal Oath; so he hath, tho' in Contradiction to himself, given such an Explication of the Words, *The Lord liveth*, in Swearing, as carry them beyond a Plain Asseveration; saying, "So when any used a more Obscure Form, as, *The Lord liveth*, tho' there was no Imprecation, (that is, expressed, he means) ---- "is it not as much
"as

"as to say, * *As sure as the Lord liveth*, it is so, or
 "so? Or, *As he lives*, and is able to punish me for Non-
 "performance of my Words, (here's the Imprecation
 understood.) "Now these (*says he*) or such things,
 "are naturally inferable from it, p. 13. And, *says*
he, "its being liable to such Inferences, hath in-
 "titled it to be an Oath, as really and substanti-
 "ally, as in the Instance aforesaid, (viz. *David's*
Case, 2 Sam. 3. 35.) "where the Imprecation is ex-
 "pressed, p. 14.

So that, even according to him, in p. 13, 14. Im-
 precations must be couched under *Asseverations*, to
 make them *Oaths*; and then consequently *Plain As-*
severations, which have no *Imprecations* couched, un-
 derstood, or implied, in the Use of them, cannot
 be deemed *Oaths*.

For the farther clearing up of this Matter, and
 fully manifesting, that the Words, *The Lord liveth*,
 or, *As the Lord liveth*, were not in themselves,
 simply consider'd, an *Oath*; I shall,

First, Give the true Meaning of the Phrase: And,

Secondly, Produce some Instances from Scripture,
 proving it to be no *Oath*, under the aforesaid Con-
 sideration.

1. The true Meaning of the Phrase, *The Lord*
Liveth; and that is as much as to say, *The Lord is*
the Living God, according to that of the Prophet,
The Lord is the True God, he is the Living God, Jer. 10.
 10. An Appellation frequently given him in the Old

* *As sure as the Lord liveth*, it is so, or so, is not an *Oath*; be-
 cause no *Imprecation* is expressed; nor can any be understood, but
 by him who can infer, *Quidlibet ē quolibet, what he will, out of*
what he pleaseth, and then call it a Natural Inference, when it is
 apparently a Violent one, and contrary to the most Natural Sense
 of the Words. For when I say, *As sure as the Lord Lives*, it is so
 or so, I intend no more than to declare the Truth of what I say,
 or that my Testimony is as True as this Proposition, or Enunciation,
The Lord Lives. And if any Inference is Naturally deducible from
 thence, it is this, He Lives to Assist, Inable and Direct me in De-
 claring or Speaking of Truth, without whose Help I cannot do it.

Testament;

Testament; see Deut. 5. 26. Josh. 3. 10. 1 Sam. 17. 26, 36. 2 Kings 19. 4, 16. Psal. 42. 2. and 84. 2. Isai. 37. 4, 17. Jer. 23. 36. Dan. 6. 20, 26. Hos. 1. 10. And a Testimony which the Lord's People were to bear, in Opposition to the False and Dead Gods, or Idols of the Heathen, of which the Psalmist saith, *They have Mouths, but they speak not; Eyes have they, but they see not; they have Ears, but they hear not; neither is there any Breath in their Mouths*, Psal. 135. 16, 17.

2. I shall produce some Instances from Scripture, which prove, that saying only, *The Lord liveth*, or, *As the Lord liveth*, was no Oath: Some are ready to think, there is more in one of these Phrases, than in the other, because of the [As], but there is not;

חי-יהוה	brew and Greek, signifying barely, <i>The</i>
Chai Jehovah.	<i>Lord liveth</i> ; so that wheresoever the
Or,	Reader meets with [As] before it, he
חי-אלהים	may be sure it is a Supplement of the
Chai Elohim.	Translators.
קִי Kûe	

When Jonathan said to David, --- *There is Peace to thee, and no Hurt*, As the Lord Liveth, 1 Sam. 20. 21. This was no Oath, but a Solemn Asseveration. So when David said to Abishai, *As the Lord liveth, the Lord shall smite him*, (speaking of Saul) or *his Day shall come to die, or he shall descend into Battel, and perish*, 1 Sam. 26. 10. where, tho' David Attests the Name of God, to get a firm Perswasion in Abishai of the Truth of what was spoken, which, according to the *Essayer's Rule*, p. 13. makes it an Oath; yet it was none, neither in its own Nature, nor in the Judgment of the *Essayer*: For David being a Prophet, and in the Immediate Openings of Life, spake this Prophetically concerning Saul; and so, according to the *Essayer*, it could be no Oath; for it was very proper and adequate for him to Attest a Divine Witness to Evidence his Testimony, p. 46. as he there speaks in Justification of the Apostle.

Nor did *Elijah* Swear, when he said to *Ahab*, As the Lord thy God liveth, *before whom I stand*, there shall not be Dew, nor Rain these Tears, but according to my Word, 1 Kings 17. 1. for here's no Imprecation express'd or implied. But upon Supposition an Imprecation could be implied, yet if the *Essayer* will stand to his own Rule, p. 46. it cannot be an Oath; for will he say, the Prophet *Elijah* did not Speak those Words in the Immediate Openings of Life?

Neither was it an Oath in the Prophet *Micajah*, when he said to the Messenger of *Ahab*, As the Lord liveth, *What the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak*, 1 Kings 22. 14. for the Reason before given.

Nay, who will say that *David* Swore, when he said, *The Lord liveth, and blessed be my Rock, and exalted be the God of the Rock of my Salvation*, 2 Sam. 22. 47. compared with *Psal.* 18. 46. Especially, seeing to say, *The Lord liveth*, is the Language which the Saints are Prophesied of to Speak in the Gospel-Day? Read *Jer.* 23. 5, 6, 7, 8. where there is a clear Prophecie of the Glorious Kingdom of Christ, and of the Speech which his True and Faithful Subjects should then use, namely, that *The Lord liveth*. Accordingly in the New Testament, the Lord is frequently stiled, *The Living God*, *Mat.* 16. 16. *John* 6. 69. *Acts* 14. 15. *Rom.* 9. 26. *2 Cor.* 3. 3. and 6. 16. *1 Thess.* 1. 9. *1 Tim.* 3. 15. and 4. 10. and 6. 17. *Heb.* 3. 12. and 9. 14. and 10. 31. and 12. 22. *Rev.* 7. 2. And said to *Live for ever and ever*, *Rev.* 4. 9, 10. and 5. 14. and 10. 6. and 15. 7. What are all these Expressions, but Coincident Phrases with that Old-Testament Form of Speech, *The Lord liveth*? and a Demonstration, that as it was to be the Language of the Saints in the Gospel-Day, fulfilling and to be fulfilled, according to that Prophecie in *Jeremiah*?

Let now the Unbyassed Reader judge, whether the *Essayer* hath not erred, in saying, "*The Lord liveth*," which is but a Plain Alleviation, was the Legal
" Oath

" Oath appointed to be made use of by the Lord
 " himself? p. 87. 'Tis acknowledg'd, the Jews were
 commanded to Swear, *The Lord liveth, &c.* *Jer.* 4. 2.
 and 12. 16. But then observe, it was *Swearing*, not
Saying only those Words, that made them an Oath.
 For they were *no Oath*, without the Word *Swear*
 express'd, or some Words annexed that necessarily
 implied an Oath.

And this agrees with the Doctrine of our Antient
 Friends in the *Treatise of Oaths*, p. 103, where they
 say, " That the word *Oath*, or *Swear*, used both by
 " Christ and the Apostle *James*, in their Prohibition,
 " is never used by *Paul* in his Asseverations: — So
 " that (*say they*) such as will have it that *Paul* Swore,
 " must bring the word *Swear*, or *Oath*, to prove it.

From which it clearly follows, that *Plain Asseve-*
rations, such as *Paul* used, in which the Name of God
 was mention'd, are not Oaths; and that there must be
 something more, than a *Plain Asseveration*, viz. an
Imprecation expressed, or with Intention implied,
 to constitute an Oath, or justly to denominate any
 Form of Speech to be *Swearing*.

This evidently overthrows a great Part of the
 chief Import and Drift of the *Essayer*, which is
 built on the Absurdity of taking *Plain Asseverations*,
 or *Asseverations* Simply consider'd, as such, to be
Oaths: And also shews the Weakness and Vanity
 of his *Syllogism*, p. 88. which runs thus;

" The Oaths which Christ prohibited under the
 " Gospel, are such and such like Oaths, which God
 " permitted and commanded under the Law;

" But the Oaths which God permitted and com-
 " manded under the Law, were Solemn Assevera-
 " tions;

" Therefore Solemn Asseverations are prohibited
 " by Christ under the Gospel.

Ans. This *Syllogism* is very Faulty; for it is re-
 ducible to no Logical Mood or Figure. It seems in-
 deed as tho' he aim'd at Forming it in *Barbara* in
 the

the first Figure; but he hath shot extreamly wide of the Mark. For,

1. In that Figure, the *Medium*, or Middle Term, should be the Subject in the *Major*, and the Predicate in the *Minor* Proposition; and never enter the Conclusion. But the *Essayer* makes his *Medium*, or Middle Term, which is the Subject of his *Major* Proposition, not to be the Predicate of his *Minor*, but of his Conclusion, and puts the Predicate of his *Major* for the Subject of his *Minor*.

2. In every *Perfect Syllogism*, there should be Three Terms only, neither more nor less. For the *Medium*, or Middle Term, refers to Two Extreams only, and disposes and knits them together. A *Fourth Term* perturbs the Frame of the *Syllogism*, and renders it Vitious. But in this are *Four Terms*, contrary to all the Rules of *Logick*, which shall be shewn by and by.

For before I do that, I shall observe to the *Reader*, that this *Syllogism* of the *Essayer* (such as it is) was designed to give the *Solemn Affirmation* a Fatal Stroke: But, contrary to his Expectation, he hath wounded his own Cause and Reputation at once in the Attempt.

1. *His own Cause*; for if the *Solemn Affirmation* is a *Solemn Asseveration*, as undoubtedly it is, and a *Solemn Asseveration* (consider'd simply, as such) is an Oath, as the *Essayer* would have it to be, but in vain; then the Apostle Paul, who used *Solemn Asseverations*, must have been a Swearer; notwithstanding the Distinctions of Religious and Temporal Matters, of Something *Extrinsick* and not *Extrinsick*, *Essential* and not *Essential*, to Excuse him. And this is a Wounding of his own Cause, and that too with the Weapon he Attacks his Neighbours. For as those Distinctions have been Weigh'd in the Balance of Scripture and Right Reason, and found light; so it hath been proved, that *Solemn Asseverations*, consider'd simply, as such, are no Oaths; and consequently, the *Solemn Affirmation* being but a *Solemn*
K *Asseveration*,

Asseveration, is not an *Oath*: And hereby, not the *Apostle* only, but all those *Faithful Friends* also, who take the Present *Solemn Affirmation*, are truly Acquitted of *Swearing*, which the *Essayer's* Argument erroneously infers upon them. For neither in the *Apostle's* Expressions, as *God is my Witness*, &c. nor in the Present *Solemn Affirmation*, is any *Imprecation*, *Curse* or *Penalty* expressed, or necessarily implied; without which, no Form of Speech whatsoever, either was or is an *Oath*.

2. *His own Reputation* is wounded by this Vicious *Syllogism*. For, for a Man to pretend to *Logick*, and not make a *True Syllogism*, but to be out both in respect of *Matter* and *Form*; this discovers his Blind Side, and exposes it to Publick View. But however Faulty his *Syllogism* is, there being but the First Part of it true; he sees nothing amiss in the other Two Parts; but admiring their Strength, says, *The Second Part must needs be true*; and the *Consequence is undeniable*, p. 89. Notwithstanding the palpable Falseness of both.

The *Essayer* having thus wounded both his *Cause* and *Reputation*, in unskilfully handling of *Logical Weapons*; I, as a Friend, advise him to forbear them for the future. Will not the Wise conclude, the Man is strangely confused, when they see him Labouring against himself, and Setting up that which he pretends to Pull down?

But to detect the Fallaciousness of the *Essayer's* Reasoning a little farther, I shall make it plain to the Reader, that there are *Four Terms* in his *Syllogism*. Every *Doubtful Word* or *Phrase*, is a *Double Term*; and such is the Phrase, *Solemn Asseverations*; by which are understood, either such as have an *Imprecation* or *Curse* express'd, or necessarily implied in them; or such as have not. The Latter were never accounted *Oaths*, but the Former *always* were.

But the *Essayer* doth not distinguish of *Solemn Asseverations*, as he ought to have done; but hides himself

himself under that *Ambiguous Phrase*, endeavouring to make his *Reader* believe, that all *Solemn Asseverations* were *Oaths*, when none were so, but those which had an *Imprecation* or *Curse* expressed, or necessarily implied in them: Let us then repeat his *Syllogism*, with distinguishing of *Solemn Asseverations*, and the *Four Terms*, I spoke of, will be visible to every Discerning Eye.

The *Oaths* which Christ prohibited under the Gospel, are such and such like *Oaths*, which God permitted and commanded under the Law:

But the *Oaths* which God permitted and commanded under the Law, were such *Solemn Asseverations*, (according to the *Essayer*) as have an *Imprecation* or *Curse* expressed, or necessarily implied in them; and such as have not;

Therefore such *Solemn Asseverations* (according to him) as have an *Imprecation* or *Curse* expressed, or necessarily implied in them, and such as have not, are both prohibited by Christ under the Gospel.

Where the Permitting and Commanding of *Oaths* is *One Term*, the Prohibiting of them *Another*; *Solemn Asseverations*, which have an *Imprecation* or *Curse* expressed, or necessarily implied in them, are a *Third*; and *Solemn Asseverations*, which have not an *Imprecation* or *Curse*, &c. are a *Fourth*.

Now by this Argument, all *Solemn Asseverations*, or *Affirmations*, whether Including the Name of God, or not; whether having an *Imprecation* or *Curse* expressed, or necessarily implied, or not, are prohibited by Christ under the Gospel; and if so, then all Simple *Yea's* (for they are *Solemn Asseverations*, or *Affirmations*, without an *Imprecation* or *Curse* expressed, or necessarily implied in them, are prohibited also.

To shew then the *Essayer* the Absurdity and Inconclusiveness of his Argument against us, Let him take it back by Retortion, and see how it militates against himself, and the whole Design of his Book,

The Oaths which Christ prohibited under the Gospel, are such and such like Oaths, which God permitted and commanded under the Law :

But the Oaths which God permitted and commanded under the Law, according to the *Essayer*, were *Yea's* ;

Therefore *Yea's*, according to him, are prohibited by Christ under the Gospel.

If he denies the *Minor*, or *Second Part* of this Argument, he must deny that *Yea* is a *Solemn Affelevation* ; and then he will contradict *Athanasius*, whose Saying he quotes, and approves of, " The Evangelical Sentence of the Lord is, *Let your Yea be Yea, and your Nay be Nay*. Thus far we, who are in Christ, may confirm our Words with *Affelevations*, Essay, p. 26. And *Samuel Fisher*, whom he commends for an *Antient and Eminent Friend*, and one who had been very Particular on this Subject, p. 59. For S. F. expressly makes *Yea* and *Nay*, Mat. 5. 37. to be *Solemn Affelevations*. See him quoted, Sect. V. p. 36. of this *Treatise*. And the Common Sense of every Person, who understands the Difference between *Swearing* and *Affirming*.

I have been long, I confess, in detecting this *Fallacious Syllogism* ; but there was a necessity of so doing, for the sake of *Truth* and *Friends* ; that while the *Essayer*, by a false Pretence to, or wilful Abuse of *Logick*, seeks the Perversion of both, I might, in the True Use and Application thereof, lay open his *Sophistry*, and shew it even to the meanest Capacity ; that they who are caught in his Snare, may see their Way out, and others may be preserved from being Intangled.

By which the Reader may see, that there is some Service in *Logick*, when 'tis rightly used, either for the Confirmation of *Truth*, or the Detection and Confutation of Error. But when Men apply their Minds to the *Sophistical* or *Fallacious* Part of it, and Study Tricks and Distinctions how to shut out *Truth*,

as *R. Barclay* well observes, *Apol.* p. 312. It leads into such a Labyrinth of Contention, as is far more fit to make a Sceptick, than a Christian, far less a Minister of Christ; yea, it often hinders Man from a clear Understanding of Things, that his own Reason would give him, *Ibid.* p. 311. And therefore is, so far, to be utterly Renounced and Abandon'd.

But as to *Natural Logick*, or the Rational Part of it, *R. Barclay* makes great Use of it in his *Apology*, and so doth *S. Fisher* in his *Rusticus ad Academicos*, and *W. Penn* in the *Spirit of Truth Vindicated*, &c. where he useth above Thirty *Sylogistical Arguments*, to prove by *Scripture*, "That God has afforded his People, in all Ages, such a Measure of his Unerring Spirit, as hath been sufficient to Inform, Rule and Guide them Infallibly, in and about those things, which are absolutely necessary to be known, or done, unto Eternal Life, p. 34. And having proved this by *Scripture*, he proceeds to prove it by *Reason* also, *Ibid.* p. 35, 36.

And to shew what Esteem *W. P.* had of *Reason*, which *R. B.* calls an *Excellent Gift of God*, Works, p. 902. and which, when *Inlightned by the Divine and Pure Light*, he confesses may be useful unto Man, even in *Spiritual Things*, as it is still *Subservient and Subject to the other*, [to wit, *The Light*] *Apol.* p. 145. I say, to shew what Esteem *W. P.* had of it, in his *Christian Quaker*, and his *Divine Testimony Vindicated*, He proves the *Universality and Sufficiency of the Light by Reason*, Chap. 23, 24. p. 120, 121, 122, 123. And then Compriseth the Contents of the Two Chapters in Four *Sylogistical Arguments*, and afterwards sums up the *Four in One*, *Ibid.* p. 123, 124.

Nor did *Roger Haydock* decline this *Logical Way* of Disputation, as may be seen in his *Hypocrite Unvail'd*, &c. being an Examination of *John Cheyney's* False Relation of his Dispute with the *Quakers* at *Arley-Hall* in *Cheshire*, 1699. for in that Examination he uses several *Sylogistical Arguments*, Collection,

p. 46, 47, 98, 123, 158. and those exactly according to what the *Logicians* call *Mood* and *Figure*.

But here perhaps it may be Objected by some, Thou hast shewn us wherein the *Essayer's* Syllogism is Vicious, but not how it should have been, for *True Form*.

Answ. To put it then in *True Form*, it will run thus;

The Oaths which Christ prohibited under the Gospel, are such and such like Oaths, which God permitted and commanded under the Law:

But *Solemn Affeверations* were the Oaths which Christ prohibited under the Gospel;

Therefore *Solemn Affeверations* are such and such like Oaths, which God permitted and commanded under the Law.

This sets the Syllogism right, as to the *Form*; tho' not as to the *Matter*, for both *Minor* and *Conclusion* are false: For Christ hath not prohibited *Solemn Affeверations* (simply consider'd, as such) under the Gospel, but commanded them in the Stead of *Swearing*; nor were they the Oaths which God permitted and commanded under the Law. But of this before.

The *Essayer's* Misrepresenting our deceased *Friends*, *G. Fox*, *Fr. Howgil*, *S. Fisher*, and *R. Barclay*, and Wrestling their True and Genuine Sense, respecting the *Present Controversie*, and even Forcing of it, to make it Serviceable to his *Groundless, Novel Hypothesis*, is so great an Injury done to those *Worthy Friends*, that nothing but a *Retraction* as Publick as the *Offence*, can make Satisfaction. Let any Impartial Man diligently peruse their Books, and he will find, that they are extreamly wrong'd by the *Essayer*. They bore a Faithful Testimony against all Oaths and *Swearing*, but never opposed or refused *Solemn Affirming*, with some Attestation of God, or his Wisdom, or Power and Presence, as, *God is my Record, God is my Witness, I declare in the Presence of God, &c.* No; they Pleaded for it, and were all ways

ways Free to do it, when there was a Necessity, as when any Man's Person or Estate, or any Part thereof, was in danger. But a True Account is already given of these things, with respect to the said *deceased Friends*, mentioned (among many others) in the *Epistle from the Meeting for Sufferings, &c.* and in the *Letter from a Satisfied to a Dissatisfied Friend, &c.* which are worthy of Perusing, and therefore to them I refer the Reader; not doubting, but every *Unbyassed Friend* will meet with full Satisfaction, as touching the Sense of those our *Ancient Friends*, in Relation to this Matter.

S E C T. VIII.

Containing some Testimonies of Friends, concerning the Lawfulness of the Reverent Using the Name of GOD in a Solemn Affirmation in Terrene Affairs, not mentioned in the Epistle from the Meeting for Sufferings, &c. Anno 1696. Or, in the Letter from a Satisfied to a Dissatisfied Friend, &c. Anno 1713. With Answers to some Objections against a Form.

THIS Section consisting of Two Parts, viz. Some Testimonies of *Friends* concerning the Lawfulness of the Reverent Using the Name of GOD in a *Solemn Affirmation* in Terrene Affairs, &c. and Answers to some Objections against a *Form*; I shall begin with those Testimonies.

1. Some

1. *Some Testimonies of Friends, concerning the Lawfulness of the Reverent Using the Name of God in a Solemn Affirmation in Terrene Affairs, &c.*

In citing of these Testimonies, I shall, as near as I can, set them down according to their *Darts*, that the Reader may see how Constant and Unanimous Friends have been, both in their Judgment and Practice, respecting this Affair, till a New Notion was started, which hath no Foundation in the Scriptures of Truth, and tendeth only to Divide and Scatter the Flock and Heritage of God.

1. *John Whitehead*, in the Year 1654. being apprehended, and by Force taken out of a Meeting at *Wellingborough* in *Northamptonshire*, and had before Two *Justices of Peace*, and accompanied with his Friend and Country-Man, *Marmaduke Storr*, who appeared in Vindication of *J. W.*'s Reputation; The Oath of *Abjuration* was required of them both by the *Justices*, whereunto they gave the Account and Answer following, *viz.* "But we both for Conscience sake refused to Swear, in Obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ, who saith, *Swear not at all*, *Mat. 5.* "and the Apostle *James* saith, *Above all things, my Brethren, Swear not, neither by Heaven, nor by the Earth, neither by any other Oath: But let your Yea be Yea, and your Nay, Nay; lest you fall into Condemnation*, *James 5.* We being like-minded to the Apostle, lest we should fall into Condemnation, Refused the Oath: But we did In the Presence of the Lord Renounce and Deny the things Renounced and Denied in the Form of that Oath, and all Principles contrary to the Spirit of Truth, which gave forth the Scriptures. The *Written Gospel Labour* of *John Whitehead*, p. 31, 32. Printed 1704.

Note, They did not deem their said Renunciation, In the Presence of the Lord, to be any Breach of Christ's Command, or Inconsistent with their Yea

or *Nay* in *Terrene Affairs*, nor *Coming of Evil*, but of the Lord God, in whose Name and Presence they Spake and Confess'd to Truth; and who shall Condemn them, when the Lord Stood by them, and Justified them?

Observation. It is not unknown to divers Friends in London, that at the Time when our Worthy Friends, *George Whitehead* and others, were Attending the Parliament for Relief in the Case of Oaths, the said *John Whitehead* took a Journey on purpose out of *Lincolnshire* to London, to Assist our Friends in their Attendance and Solicitation in that Case, and accordingly he was very Helpful therein; not at all scrupling the Name of GOD in the Solemn Affirmation, but after it was obtain'd of the Government, openly Affirmed, That it was no Oath, in the Year 1696.

2. *Miles Halhead* and *Thomas Salthouse*, being detained in Prison by the Mayor of Plymouth, in the Year 1655, for Refusing to take the Oath of Abjuration, and upon Suspicion that they were Jesuites, write thus to the Mayor, "Forasmuch as it hath pleased thee to cast us into Prison, and hast Examined us, and hast found no Breach of any Law, by which thou canst Lawfully Punish us; but under a Pretence hast tendred us an Oath, to Swear against the Supremacy and Purgatory: We do in the Presence of the Lord God of Heaven and Earth, deny the Pope, and all things therein mentioned, with as much Detestation, as thou thy self, or any in the World can, or doth, our Consciences also bearing us Witness in the Presence of our God. See their Book, Intituled, *The Wounds of an Enemy in the House of a Friend*, &c. p. 70. Printed 1656.

Being removed from Plymouth to Exeter, at the General Sessions of the Peace, publickly holden at the Castle there, 1655. *M. H.* and *T. S.* being called into Court, and the Oath of Abjuration tendred to them, refused to Swear, but Declared as fol-

loweth; "*In the Presence of the Eternal God, and before*
 "*all this People, we do deny, with as much Detestation*
 "*as any of you do, the Pope and his Supremacy, and*
 "*the Purgatory, and all therein mentioned, and de-*
 "*clare freely against it, Ibid. p. 19.*

These *Friends*, in Obedience to the Command of *Christ*, Mat. 5. 34. and of the *Apostle James*, Chap. 5. 12. durst not Swear at all, but were come to Yea and Nay in their Communications; see *The Wounds of an Enemy*, &c. p. 21. And yet they did Declare in the Presence of the Lord God of Heaven and Earth, or, In the Presence of the Eternal God, in a Civil or Terrene Affair; for such the Oath of Abjuration was.

Thomas Salthouse, being Fined Five Pound, upon Suspicion of his being a *Jesuite*, and for refusing to take the Oath of Abjuration, and coming into, and standing in the Court Covered, in Contempt of, and contrary to the Command of the Court, by the *Justices* at the Sessions at *Taunton*, in the County of *Somerset*, 1657. returned this Answer from *Ilchester Prison*, in Vindication of himself, "I do hereby, in the Fear and Presence of the Lord God Almighty, who is the Searcher of all Hearts, signifie, as I did in open Court declare before the *Justices* sitting in *Castle-Hall* at *Taunton*, That I do utterly deny the Pope and his Supremacy, and all the Consecrated Hosts, Crucifixes and Images, --- with all the Particulars exprest'd in that Relation, called the Oath of Abjuration, as I then declared, and the Reason wherefore I refused to Swear, I shewed. In *Robert Wastfeild's True Testimony of Faithful Witnesses Recorded*, p. 65. Printed 1657.

"For neither am I (*saith T. S.*) a *Jesuite*, as here it is supposed, nor any way concerned in that Oath intended for *Jesuites*, which was imposed upon me as a Snare, which I refused not to take, because of any Guilt that was upon me, but in the Fear of, and Obedience to him, who saith,

"Swear

“Swear not at all: And so to that of God in the Con-
 “sciences of all, that have heard and known me, and
 “unto whom this may come, I freely declare, that
 “I speak the Truth, and the God and Father of our
 “Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore, knoweth
 “that I lie not. — And whereas it is laid as a Charge
 “against me, that I deny the Magistracy, Laws
 “and Government of this Common-wealth; I An-
 “swer, as I did in open Court, That I do own the
 “Magistracy, and the Power ordained of God, &c.
Ibid. p. 66, 67.

And as to the Custom of *Putting off the Hat*, he
 saith, “To me (and my Friends and Fellow-
 “Sufferers) it is *Matter of Conscience*, and we dare
 “not do it at the Request of any Man, altho’ we
 “suffer Persecution, Punishment, Bonds or Impri-
 “sonment for not doing it, *Ibid.* p. 68.

“But this I say, (as it may be remembred I did
 “when the thing was question’d in the Court)
 “that if any Man come into, and stand with his
 “*Hat* on, or Cover’d, in Contempt of the Court or
 “Authority, I utterly deny that Spirit and Princi-
 “ple. And so to the Just and Faithful Witness of God
 “in the Consciences of all, who are Sober-minded and
 “Simple-hearted, I humbly Present these things, to be
 “weighed and considered, *Ibid.* p. 69.

And whereas it was laid as a Charge against *Thomas Salthouse*, that he had great Meetings at *Aish*, in
 the Parish of *Martock*, whereunto Persons came with
 Staves, Pikes, and such-like Weapons, and that
 some of those that thus inform’d, supposed great
 danger of Blood, and danger likewise to the *Pro-*
tektor might have ensu’d, by occasion of such Meet-
 ings, had not the Neighbours and Soldiers come in
 to keep the Peace: Several Friends went out of the
 Court, and drew up a *Letter*, which was deliver’d
 to the Judge of the Sessions (at *Taunton* aforesaid)
 wherein they Testifie, that the Violence, Tumult,
 and Disorder there committed, was by the Ministers

and their Party, who came with Staves, Clubs, Pikes, and other Weapons, and very much abused Friends, who were Peaceably Assembled; and say, "Now do we leave it to that of God in your Consciences to be Judged, whether we and our Friends, who have received so many (and those so) Inhumane Abuses --- ought not --- rather to be Vindicated and Avenged of the Wrongs aforesaid, than that some of our Friends should be thus Slander'd and Imprison'd.

"And lastly, concerning *Thomas Salthouse* (our dear Friend) *In Meekness, and in the Fear of the Lord, we give this Testimony*, that we know him to be a Sober and Peaceable Man, *Ibid.* p. 62.

"Now unto the Faithful Witness of God in you, which respects no Man's Person, but cries unto all, to do as they would be done unto, and which is Present with you at all Times, either to Acquit or Condemn; and if this condemn, God is greater, and will condemn also: Even unto Him we leave our Cause, who in his due time will render unto you, and every Man, a due Reward, according to his Works done in the Body, whether Good or Evil. Signed by

Christopher Pittard,
William Beaton,
John Collins,
Richard Adams,
Thomas Budd,
Jasper Bat,

George Taylor,
John Pitman,
Edward Taylor,
Thomas Cattle,
Henry Laver,
Robert Wastfield.

Ibid. p. 63.

At the same Sessions, *James Hobbs, Thomas Loscombe, and Christopher Bacon*, being Fined Five Pound a piece, for denying (as was pretended) the Magistracy, Laws and Government of the Commonwealth, and for standing Cover'd in Court, in Contempt, and contrary to the Command of the same; in Answer to which False Aspersions cast upon them, they write thus, "We do hereby signify, with one Consent,

“*sent, and in the Fear and Presence of the Lord, as*
 “*One Man, declare plainly to all People, where-*
 “*soever this may come, that we did not stand Co-*
 “*ver’d (when we were brought into the Court) in*
 “*Contempt thereof, &c. --- And we never spake*
 “*such a Word, as denying Magistracy, Law or Go-*
 “*vernment; --- we know no Law, either of God*
 “*or Man, that requires us to Put off our Hats; ---*
 “*we remain as Witnesses against all Unrighteous*
 “*Decrees, and Unjust Laws, made in Mens Wills,*
 “*to Ensnare and make a Préy upon the Innocent,*
 “*contrary to the Will and Perfect Law of God,*
 “*to whom we leave our Cause to be judged, Ibid.*
 p. 64.

Consider, whether *Thomas Salthouse*, and the other Friends before mentioned, transgressed the Precept of Christ, Yea or Nay; they could not Swear, and yet they did *Declare in the Fear and Presence of the Lord, in Terrene Affairs.*

3. *James Parnel*, tho’ he was against all Swearing, and a strict Observer of Yea and Nay; yet being Accused in the Year 1655. that he *could give no good Account of his last Settlement*, Answer’d, *As for my Settlement, it is in the Lord; --- Telling his Adversaries, that they were the Shelterers of the false Prophet; --- yet it is, saith he, but for a Time: For the Hand of the Almighty is against you.* Fruits of a Fast, in Collection, p. 262, 263. Printed 1675. And speaking of their Persecuting, and casting the Messengers and Servants of Jesus Christ into Prisons, and Dungeons, and Holes, in the Protector’s Name; saith, “What a Liberty of Conscience is this? And how will this Stand in the Presence of Almighty God---?---In the Day of the Lord’s Vengeance, he will be avenged of all his Adversaries, Ibid. p. 264.

Again, in a Letter to Judge Hills, after the Assizes at Chelmsford, 1655. where J. P. being Fined contrary to all Law and Equity, saith, “For the clearing of my Conscience unto thee, I was moved to
 “ write

“ write, that thou might’st see what thou hast done,
 “ and be left without Excuse of Ignorance, in the
 “ Presence of the Almighty; for contrary to the Light
 “ of God in thy Conscience thou hast acted, by which
 “ thou standest Accused in the Presence of the Al-
 “ mighty, --- *Fruits of a Fast*, p. 284.

“ Thou wilt not allow me in thy Bonds to have
 “ the outward Liberty, that thou allowest to *Thieves*,
 “ and *Murtherers*, and *Fornicators*; that is, to have
 “ my Friends and Acquaintance to come to see me,--
 “ tho’ I am a *Free-born Subject in England*: And were
 “ not these *Terrene Affairs*? And yet he adds, “ *This*
 “ *of the Lord was I moved to write, which is the Word*
 “ *of the Lord unto thee*, Ibid. p. 286.

In his Paper to all *Magistrates, Rulers and Officers*,
 who call Men to Swear, and Imprison them if they
 will not, he saith, “ *I charge you in the Presence of*
 “ *the Living God*, to take heed of Oppressing --- or
 “ Forcing any Tender Consciences, or Fining them,
 “ or Imprisoning them, for Obeying God rather
 “ than your Wills; for, if you do, *To be sure the*
 “ *Plagues and Woes of God shall come upon you*, Coll.
 p. 473.

Thus J. P. scrupled not the Reverent Use of the
Name of God in Terrene Affairs.

4. *Will. Dewsbury*, in the Year 1655. being brought
 before the Magistrates at *Darby*, and the first Question
 being thus propounded to him, *In whose Presence dost*
thou stand? He Answer’d, *In the Presence of the Ever-*
lasting God. --- When the *Mayor of Darby* asked him,
Wilt thou go out of the Town? He Answer’d, *When*
the Lord orders me to go forth, then I shall go; till then
I shall stay. And as he Answer’d the *Mayor*, so he
 did one of his *Officers*, who said to him, *If thou wilt*
go forth of the Town, and in it no more come, I will open
the Doors for thee to come forth, [*viz. of Prison.*] To
 whom *W. D.* replied, *Out of the Town I shall not go,*
until I am ordered of the Lord. Works, p. 38. Printed
 1689. See also his Answer, p. 34. to *John Lockwood*,
 High

High Constable, who having apprehended him with a Warrant at Crake, and the Day being far spent, said to him, "I shall not go with thee to the Justice to Night, until to Morrow stay at thy Friend's House. W. D. replied, "If thou say I shall stay here, *If the Lord please, I shall be ready to go with thee, where he gives thee Power to have me.*

One John Tinson, in the Year 1656. having charged many Lyes and Slanders upon Friends, W. D. saith, "In the Presence of God I charge thee to be a Lyar, in the Slanders and Lyes before written. Works, p. 118.

"In the Presence of God we Witness against thee. Ibid. p. 119.

"The doing any thing in Hypocrisie we deny, or to deceive any, *The Lord is our Witness,* Ibid. p. 120.

"In the Presence of God we Witness against thee, Ibid. p. 121.

"To that of God in every ones Conscience, I appeal, that Lyes proceed from a Carnal, Wretched Heart. Ibid. p. 123.

"Doing any thing of purpose to deceive, through Hypocrisie or Knavish Heads, we deny, *And in the Presence of God we Speak the Truth in Plainness.* Ibid. p. 136.

In a Letter to a Friend, in the Year 1657. he saith, "If God will, I may be at Justice Crips's in Gloucestershire the next Third Day, and at Slettingford Twelve Miles from Bristol the Fourth Day; If God will, I may be at Bristol the Sixth or the First Day, being the 18th of this Month. Ibid. p. 174.

Writing to King Charles the II^d, in the Year 1661. he saith, "Tho' they [viz. his Enemies] were never so Invincible for Strength, and Clothed with Policy and Wisdom of this World, *The Lord hath, and will break them down by the Arm of his Mighty Power.* Ibid. p. 186.

"And

“ And *this is the Work of the Mighty God, who hath preserved Thee in Safety.* *Ibid.* p. 187.

And in a *General Epistle, &c.* in the Year 1682. he saith, “ When I did hear that some in the *West*, did intend to Publish in Print against some Friends; “ I bore my Testimony against such Proceedings, “ and told one that did Favour what was intended, “ *That I would have my Hand cut off, before I would exercise it in such Undertakings: And desired him to speak to W. R. [William Rogers] that he would not proceed in Publishing any thing of that Nature, &c.* So to clear my Conscience of all *False Reports* cast upon me, as that I have encouraged what is brought forth as before written, “ and to Satisfie all Friends in God, *I have laboured according to the Ability God hath given me, to prevent the Publishing all things of that Nature, as* *aforesaid.* *Ibid.* p. 361.

Note, All the Places before quoted out of *W. D.* where the *Name of God* is used, respect *Terrene Affairs.*

5. *Edward Burroughs*, in *The State of the Controversie depending in the Court of Kingston upon Thames, between Richard Mayo Plaintiff, and himself Defendant,* in the Year 1658. saith, “ *The Lord knows, and just Men know, and the Witness of God in your Consciences* “ *may shew you, that I have not wronged Richard Mayo, nor spoken of him any thing, saving the Truth, and because thereof, and without any other Cause, am I thus prosecuted by him, in his Pleading before you, and begging of you for False Judgment; which if he should obtain it, and you should give it, yet should I be clear in the sight of the Lord, tho’ by you I may deeply Suffer. — To God I have Appealed in this thing. — Therefore in the Fear of the Lord God, I say unto you; Take heed what you do in this matter; but deal impartially in the Sight of the Lord, in the Examination thereof.* *Works,* p. 375. Printed 1672.

“ And

" And farther I say unto you, I have had no Intentions of Evil against him, nor Purpose in my Heart to endanger or damnifie him in any outward Thing, God is my Witness.---- Let that of God in you Answer. Ibid. p. 378, 379.

" James Leuire---- took his Oath against me, That I followed Richard Mayo with Reviling Language, in three several Rooms, in Bailiff Gunstone's House. Which I do Testifie was a False Oath before the Lord, and all Men. Ibid. p. 380.

" Tho' I be Condemned by the Prejudiced and Unfaithful Jury for Speaking Maliciously; yet the Lord bears me Witness to the contrary, that I have no Malice in me against any Man. Ibid. p. 382.

In his *Epistle to the Reader*, (which was written in the Year 1658. and prefix'd to G. Fox's *Great Mystery, &c.*) having given an Account how hardly He and other Friends were dealt withal, by Priests, Rulers and People, through all the Northern Counties of England, &c. in their first going forth, by Beatings, Bruisings, Imprisonment, &c. He Avers the Truth thereof by a *Solemn Attestation and Appeal*, in these Words, " I call Heaven and Earth to Record, and the Light in every Man's Conscience, and do Appeal to that in all Sorts and Places of People, That by all sorts of People we suffer'd Evil, and Unjust Works and Actions, and Words from them; and Let the Witness of God in all Men's Consciences, in all the North, give Testimony what Dealings and Cruelty we suffer'd, &c. Works, Epist. p. 14.

In his *Epistle to the King and his Council*, Anno 1661. E. B. having inform'd them of Thousands [viz. of Quakers] that were cast into Goals, and Dungeons and Nasty Holes, where divers finish'd their Lives, &c. saith, " And are these things nothing to you? &c. Let the God of Heaven and Earth Judge in this matter between this People and you. Works, p. 770.

And in his *Just and Righteous Plea, presented to the*

King, &c. the same Year, he saith, " All these
 " things [viz. *what he had been Speaking of before*]
 " rightly considered, it doth fully appear;

1. " That we are not Enemies, neither in present
 " Action, nor future Intent, to the King's Person
 " or Authority.

2. " Nor that we refuse to acknowledge Just Au-
 " thority to King *Charles* the Second, as Supreme
 " Magistrate over these Kingdoms.

3. " Nor doth it appear, that we are otherwise
 " than Peaceable and Quiet People under the King's
 " Government.

4. " Nor is it manifest, but that we are ready to
 " acknowledge so to continue, in all good Consci-
 " ence and Righteousness. *And therefore we do Ap-
 " peal to the God of Heaven, and to King Charles, and
 " to all People whatsoever; That our Present Sufferings
 " by Imprisonment, and whatsoever else we may
 " Suffer in this Case, for refusing to take the Oath
 " of Allegiance, it is not for Plotting against the
 " King, &c. --- And we call God and Just Men to
 " Witness between us and our Prosecutors, --- Works,*
 p. 776.

Thus we see, E. B. *Called God to Witness, Appealed
 to God, Spake in the Fear of the Lord, Testified before
 the Lord, said, Let the God of Heaven and Earth be
 Judge, &c. in Terrene Affairs. And this was his
 Tea; for tho' he could not Swear, yet he could In-
 voke, and Attest the Name of God, and Appeal to him
 as Judge, upon Temporal Occasions. See more in
 the Epistle from the Meeting for Sufferings, p. 7, 15,
 16. and the Letter from a Satisfied to a Dissatisfied
 Friend, p. 7, 8.*

6. *Francis Howgil, in the Year 1639. Expostula-
 ting with the Persecuting Priests of that Day,
 " Would you have any of your Flock to come and
 " fetch away a Yoke of your Oxen, or a Couple of
 " your Horses, &c.? Or, would you be Sued up
 " Two Hundred Miles into a Court for a Tithe-
 " Hen,*

“ Hen, worth Four-pence or Six-pence, and thrown
 “ into the *Fleet* a Year or two, for Four or Five
 “ Shillings? *He saith*, “ Many Evidences and Ex-
 “ amples we have from you, you late Reformers!
 “ But to the *Light in all Consciences I leave to Judge*,
 “ (which you have presumptuously sinned against)
 “ what Examples you are to your Flocks, *Mystery*
Babylon discover’d, in his *Works*, p. 163.

Answering a *Popish Writer*, *Anno 1662*. about the
Priests Turning the Bread and Wine into the Flesh
 and *Blood of Christ*, who confess, “ That the Na-
 “ tural Elements of Bread and Wine still remain
 “ in sight (after *Consecration*) but the Substance, Na-
 “ ture and Matter are no more in Being, *saith*,
 “ I shall Appeal to the *Light of Christ in your Con-*
 “ *sciences*, whether this be true, *Yea or Nay*. The
Rock of Ages Exalted, &c. in his *Works*, p. 509.

“ If we say — *God is our Witness*, or, *We speak the*
 “ *Truth in God’s Presence*, (for they offer’d to give
 their Testimony in those and the like Forms, in
 Cases of Evidence) “ yet notwithstanding this
 “ would never give Satisfaction to any Magistrate
 “ in any Judicature, that ever we knew or heard
 “ of in *England*. *Oaths no Gospel-Ordinance*, in An-
 swer to *Dr. Smallwood*, *Anno 1666*. *Works*, p. 691.

In the same Year his *Will* is dated, wherein he
 speaks thus to his Daughter *Abigail Howgil*, “ I charge
 “ thee before God, and by the Coming of our Lord *Jesus*
 “ *Christ*, that thou observe what I say, which I am
 “ moved of the Lord to leave thee behind, --- First of
 “ all know this, I was never born to great Posses-
 “ sions, or did inherit great matters in this World,
 “ but the Lord hath always Endowed me with Suffici-
 “ ency, --- I have no great Portion to bestow upon
 “ thee of the Things of this World, yet of that lit-
 “ tle which I have, and that God hath blessed me with,
 “ something I shall give thee, which I shall not men-
 “ tion here, but thou wilt know at my Decease; but
 “ thy Dear Mother I rather Commend thee to, ---

" she had a Sufficient Portion and Dowry when I
 " Married her, the which I shall be sorry much to
 " Lessen or Impair, and whatever was her's (*If it
 " please the Lord I decease before her*) I freely leave
 " unto her, as was ever my Intention and Purpose,
 " which hath not, neither shall alter, (*through the
 " Strength of God*) as God only Knows, and bears me
 " Record, as shall be manifest unto all in due time, as
 " it is unto the Lord. Will, p. 1. prefixed to his Works.

Are not all these Quotations out of F. H's Works,
 Instances of his Reverent using the Name of God in
Terrene Affairs? And who will say, That he Swore in
 any one of them, who wrote so well, as he did a-
 gainst all Oaths, and *Suffered near Five Years Impri-*
sonment at Appleby in Westmorland, even unto Death,
for his Testimony against Swearing? *Epistle from the*
Meeting for Sufferings, p. 9. where, and p. 7, 10, as
 also in the *Letter from a Satisfied to a Dissatisfied*
Friend, p. 7, 8, 17. the Reader may see more as to
 F. H's Sentiments about this matter.

7. " William Gray, James Findly, John Gray, Ro-
 " bert Smally, John Robine, were summoned to be
 " upon a Jury at Dunbarton, and when they came
 " there, and went within the Bar, they [*viz. some
 " of the Court*] " pull'd off their Bonnets, and bad
 " them Swear; unto whom, They [*W. Gray, J. Find-
 " ly, &c.*] " Answered, *They would not Swear, but they
 " will tell the Truth, and take God to be their Wit-
 " nesses upon it*: But this they [*the Court*] would not
 " receive; for John Callhone, called the Sheriff's De-
 " puty, bad them Swear by God, and Hold up their
 " Hands, [*the Gesture used in Scotland in Swearing*]
 " or go into Prison; and it was answered, We dare
 " not Transgress the Doctrine of Christ, who said,
 " Swear not at all; he [*J. Callhone*] said, It was but
 " the Law of Christ that bad Men not Swear, but
 " the Law of God bad Men Swear; and so would
 " have set the Old Law over Christ, who is the End
 " of it, who forbids Swearing: And because they
 " durst

" durst not Transgress the Doctrine of Christ, in
 " which the Apostle lived, who said, *Above all things,*
 " *my Brethren, Swear not at all,* they put them all Five
 " into Prison. See *The Doctrine and Principles, the*
Persecution, Imprisonment, Banishment, Excommunicat-
ing of the Saints of God, by the Priests and Magistrates
of Scotland, contrary to the Doctrine of Christ and the
Apostles, p. 81. By George Weare, and others, Printed
 1659.

These Friends of Scotland would not Swear, be-
 cause they durst not Transgress the Doctrine of
 Christ; but they were ready, in a *Terrene Affair,*
viz. Serving upon a Jury, to Tell the Truth, and take
God to be their Witness, because agreeable to his Do-
 ctrine.

8. *James Naylor, in the Year 1659. after his Reco-*
very out of his Fall, by the Infinite Mercy of God,
through deep Humiliation, and sincere Repentance,
to clear himself of two False and Scandalous Accu-
sations, viz. " As if he had committed Adultery
" with some of those Women who came with him
" from Exeter-Prison, and also those who were with
" him at Bristol, the Night before he Suffer'd there,
saith, " Of both which Accusations I am Clear before
" God, who kept me at that Day, both in Thought
" and Deed, as to all Women, as a little Child,
" God is my Record. See his Paper beginning, Glory
to God Almighty, who Ruleth in the Heavens, and in
whose Hands are all the Kingdoms of the Earth, &c.
 p. 3. London, Printed for Thomas Symmonds, 1659.

Was not the Charge of Committing *Adultery, &c.*
 a *Terrene Matter?* And doth not he *Solemnly Affirm*
 his Clearness *Before God,* and call *God to Record*
 upon it? Certainly he thought such a Solemn Af-
 firmation with the Attestation of God, was not
 more than *Yea and Nay,* but agreeable to the Pre-
 cept of Christ, and consequently not of an higher
 Nature, but of the same Degree of Speech.

9. *Samuel Fisher*, in the Year 1660. who bore a Faithful Testimony against all Oaths and Swearing, was notwithstanding a Zealous Advocate for the Reverent Using the Name of God in a Solemn Affirmation in Terrene Affairs, as may be seen in the Quotations cited out of his Works, in the *Epistle from the Meeting for Sufferings*, p. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. To which I shall add one Testimony more of his, for the using of these Phrases, viz. "To Profess, Testifie and Declare" in our Consciences Before God; -- Or, To Declare "as in the Sight of GOD, who is Witness that we Lye not, and knows the Truth of our Hearts, and in the Presence of the Living GOD. Works, p. 799. Or, To Assert, Deny or Promise, as in GOD's Presence, and to say, GOD is Witness that we Lye not, Ibid. p. 800. and that upon a meer Civil or Temporal Occasion, as the Places cited manifest. The Paragraphs are large, and therefore I have not transcrib'd them, but do desire the Reader to peruse them at his leisure. The Subject S. F. is upon, is, the Acknowledging King *Charles II.* to be the Right Heir to these his Kingdoms, the Denying of the Pope, and all Papal Authority to Depose the King, or to Dispose of any of his Kingdoms, &c. Promising to be Faithful, Trusty and Peaceable Subjects to the King, tho' we cannot take up Arms, or Carnal Weapons for our Selves or any Man; Abhorring, Detesting and Renouncing, as Impious and Heretical, this Damnable Doctrine and Position, That Princes, which be Excommunicated or Deprived by the Pope, may be Deprived or Murthered by their Subjects, or any other whatsoever; and Engaging to be Subject in Civil Things to all just Laws, &c. This is the Substance of the two Paragraphs: And to add a Sanction and gain Credit to what S. F. (in the Name of Friends) Professeth, Testifyeth, Declareth, Asserteth, Denyeth or Promiseth, in Terrene Affairs, he uses the Forms of Speech before mentioned, which are Solemn Affirmations, Before God, In the Sight

Sight of God, who is Witness, &c. In the Presence of the Living God, &c.

S. F. hath so Clearly, Plainly, Fully, and Emphatically Express'd himself upon this Occasion, as tho' Foreseeing what Objections might be raised in After-Times, by Men of Scrupulous or Contentious Spirits, he designed his Discourse for an Antidote or Preservative against Infection.

10. *George Fox* the Younger, in the Year 1660. in his *Noble Salutation, &c.* to *K. Charles II.* concerning Government and Governours, saith, " *This I declare in the Truth and Presence of the Lord, and I know there are many Thousands in these Nations, that are of the same Mind with me, that it is not for the Name, that may be put upon a Government, that we either stand for or against; but it is a Righteous Government --- which we stand for, and earnestly desire after, both in things appertaining to GOD and MAN; that is, in things Religious or Civil, Spiritual or Temporal.* Collection, p. 124. Printed 1662.

" *It is that which is Unrighteous --- that we stand against; --- we cannot stand for any of the Names, nor submit unto the Unjust Things commanded by them, any other ways, than through a Patient Suffering under it: And this, according to the strength of the Lord, we shall be willing to do, Ibid.* p. 125.

Concerning Plotting, or Using a Carnal Weapon, &c.

" *And I, saith G. Fox the Younger, farther Testifie in the Lord, that I do not intend, neither have I any such Thought in my Heart, either to Plot for or against Thee (the King) or any other upon the Earth; for I do not expect Deliverance by a Carnal Sword, Ibid. p. 127.*

Note, Government, Governours, Plotting, and Carnal Weapons, are certainly Terrene Affairs, concerning which G. F. declares in the Truth and Presence of the Lord, &c. to gain Credit to his Affirmation or Declaration.

11. *John Crook*, in his *Cry of the Innocent for Justice*, being a Relation of his Tryal, and others, at the General Sessions held at the *Old Baily, London*, in the Year 1662. said to the Clerk of the Court, "Read the Preface to the Act; I say again, Read the Title and Preamble to the Act: For Titles to Laws are *Claves Legum*, as Keys to open the Law; for by their Titles, Laws are understood and known, as Men by their Faces. Then the Judges would have interrupted me, but I said as followeth: If you will not hear me, nor do me Justice, I must Appeal to the Lord God of Heaven and Earth, who is Judge of Quick and Dead; before whom we must all appear, to give an Account of the Deeds done in the Body; for he will judge between me and you this day, whether you have done me Justice or not. Design of Christianity, p. 158. Printed 1701.

"Judge. Mr. Crook, -- will you answer Guilty, or Not Guilty? If not, you will run your self into a *Premunire* unavoidably, -- we tender you the Oath.

"J. C. Then it seems you make the Law a Trap to Ensnare me, or as a Nose of Wax, or what you please: Well! I shall leave my Cause with the Lord, who will plead for me in Righteousness, Ibid. p. 165.

"Judge. --- Either answer Guilty, or Not Guilty, or Judgment will be given against you.

"J. C. I will speak the Truth as before the Lord, as all along I have endeavoured to do; I am not Guilty of that which is False, contained in the Indictment, Ibid. p. 168.

Judge. Stop their Mouths, Executioner.

"J. C. --- You had as good take away our Lives at the Bar, as to command us thus to be abused, and to have our Mouths stopped: Was ever the like known? Let the Righteous God judge between us, Ibid. p. 173.

These

These Passages expressly shew, that J. Crook thought it not inconsistent with *Yea* or *Nay*, to make Reverent Mention of the Name of God in a Terrene Affair. For, saith he, in the *Case of Swearing Discussed*, written in the Year 1660. "Calling God to
 "Witness, or saying, God is my Witness, is no more
 "than to say, I Speak in God's Presence, or, Before
 "Him, who knows the Hearts and Thoughts of all Men;
 "and is no Formal Oath, as it is called, or commonly used, in Opposition to a Plain and Earnest
 "Expression of a Man's Mind. *Design of Christianity*, p. 77, 78.

12. Isaac Grey (Doctor of Physick) at the same Court of Sessions at the Old-Baily, in the Year 1662. where John Crook was Tried, having the Oath of Allegiance tendred to him, desired to know the Cause of his first Imprisonment --- before he gave his Answer to the Oath; "for I do not, saith he, know
 "my self guilty of any Crime.

"Judge. The Law supposeth you to be disaffected to the Present Government, and therefore the
 "Oath is tendred to you.

"I. Grey. I understand that the Fundamental Law of England alloweth no Man to be accused or condemned upon Supposition: I do farther Affirm, and that in the Light of God, that I am not
 "an Enemy to the King, nor to any Man living
 "upon the Face of the Earth.

"Judge. Will you answer Guilty, or Not Guilty? --
 "Will you yet Swear, or Plead to the Indictment?

"I. G. -- Would you have Men Swear, whether they will or nay, especially when against their
 "Conscience?

"Judge. Do not I tell you, if you will plead Not Guilty, you shall be heard? But if you will not,
 "you will run your self into a *Premunire*.

"I. G. I Appeal then to God Almighty, for I shall not wrong my Conscience. See J. Crook's Cry of the Innocent, &c. in *Design of Christianity*, p. 197, 198, 199.

13. *Margaret Fell* (by her Second Marriage, *Margaret Fox*) her Examination before Judge *Twisden*, at the Assizes held at *Lancaster*, 1663.

"Judge. The Jury is to hear nothing but me, to
"tender you the *Oath* [of *Allegiance*] and you to
"refuse it, or take it. *Brief Collection, &c.* p. 279.
Printed 1710.

"*M. F.* You will not let me have the Liberty that
"other Prisoners have. --- And then she turned to
"the Jury, and said; Friends,---for obeying Christ's
"Commands and Doctrine, who hath said, Swear
"not at all, am I here Arraigned this Day. --- So I
"now Appeal to the Witnesses of God in all your Con-
"sciences, to Judge of me according to that. You are
"to consider this Statute, what it was made for,
"and for whom: It was made to manifest the Pa-
"pists, and the *Oath* was for *Allegiance* to the King,
Ibid. p. 280.

At the Assizes holden at *Lancaster*, in the Year 1664. she was brought before Judge *Turner*, and the *Indictment* read.

"Judge.---What say you to the *Oath*, and to the
"Indictment?

"*M. F.* I say this to the *Oath*, as I have said in
"this Place before now, Christ Jesus hath com-
"manded me, Not to Swear at all; and that is the
"only Cause, and no other, The Righteous Judge of
"Heaven and Earth knows, before whose Throne of
"Justice you must all Appear one Day; and his Eye sees
"us all, and beholds us at this Present, and he hears
"and sees all our Words and Actions: And therefore
"every one ought to be serious; for the Place of Judge-
"ment is weighty. And This I do Testifie unto you here,
"where the Lord's Eye beholds us all, That for the
"Matter or Substance of the *Oath* [of *Allegiance*]
"and the End for which it was intended, I do own
"one Part, and deny the other: That is to say, I
"do own Truth, and Faithfulness, and Obedience
"to the King, in all his Just and Lawful Demands
"and

“and Commands. I do also deny all Plottings and
 “Contrivings against the King, and all Popish Su-
 “premacý and Conspiracy. --- And I do not deny
 “this Oath only, because it is the Oath of Allegiance;
 “but I deny it, because it is an Oath, and because
 “Christ Jesus hath said, Swear not at all, Ibid,
 p. 286.

A Paper, Intituled, *A Declaration and an Infor-
 mation from us, the People of God, called Quakers, to the
 present Governours, the King and both Houses of Parlia-
 ment, and all whom it may concern.* Signed, Margaret
 Fell, and dated the 5th of the 4th Month, 1660.

To which is annexed, by way of Testimony and
 Approbation, as followeth;

“We, in the Unity of the Spirit, and Members
 “of Christ, do Subscribe and Witness to this, and
 “in behalf of those in the same Unity,

George Fox,	Gerrard Roberts,
Richard Hubberthorn,	John Stubbs,
Samuel Fisher,	Thomas Coveny,
Joseph Fuce,	Thomas Harte,
Gobert Sikes,	James Strut,
Amos Stodert,	Ellis Hookes.
William Caton,	

See *Brief Collection*, &c. p. 202, 210.

In which Paper, having given an Account of the
 great Sufferings they underwent for several Years,
 under the *Former Powers*, not for the Breach of any
 Just Law of the Nation, but for Conscience sake
 towards God; and Declared, (to take off all Jealou-
 sies, Fears and Suspicions of their Truth and Fide-
 lity to the King, and their Present Governours)
 that their Intentions and Endeavours are and shall
 be Good, True, Honest and Peaceable towards them;
 they write thus, “The Liberty we do desire, is, that
 “we may keep our Consciences clear, and void of
 “Offence towards God and towards Men, and that
 “we may enjoy our *Civil Rights and Liberties*, as
 “Free-born Englishmen: And This we do in the Pre-
 sence

" *sence of the Lord declare, not in Flattering Titles,*
 " *but in Realty and Truth of our Hearts, and shall*
 " *manifest the same, Ibid. p. 205.*

Observe from the whole; The Words, *viz. I now Appeal to the Witness of God, &c. The Righteous Judge of Heaven and Earth knows, &c. And his Eye sees us all, and beholds us all at this present; and he hears and sees all our Words and Actions: And this I Testifie unto you here, where the Lord's Eye beholds us all; and this we do in the Presence of the Lord declare; (speaking with respect to the Oath, Indictment, Plottings, Civil Rights and Properties, as Free-born Englishmen)* are Equivalent with those used in the Solemn Affirmation, being the same for Substance; and in Effect as much as if she, and every one that Subscribed the Declaration aforesaid, had severally said, *I—do Declare in the Presence of Almighty God, the Witness of the Truth of what I say; and that in Terrene Affairs.*

14. James Pitton, in the Year 1663. saith, " *They*
 " *that are come to Christ, are come out of Swear-*
 " *ing in general, to Yea and Nay; or, if the Matter*
 " *requires (being not Bound so narrowly to such*
 " *Words," viz. As the Monosyllables Yea and Nay)*
 " *to make what we Aver more Credible, To call*
 " *God to Record, as Paul did, That it is, or is not so.*
Just Plea against Swearing, &c. p. 5. Printed 1663.

" *We can Solemnly Aver at this Time, and Call the*
 " *LORD of Heaven and Earth to Witness, that, &c.*
Ibid. p. 9.

15. Gervase Benson, in a Book, Intituled, *A True Testimony concerning Oaths and Swearing, &c. Printed in the Year 1669.* saith, that " *An Oath or Swearing*
 " *was in long time after Witness-bearing; for we*
 " *read, that Eve, before the Fall, did bear Wit-*
 " *ness, concerning what the Lord had said, * Gen.*
 " *3. 3. And Sarai after the Fall --- did call the Lord*
 " *to Witness, or Judge betwixt her and Abraham ||,*
 " *Gen. 18. 5. without any Oath or Swearing, p. 7.*

* *God hath said, Ye shall not Eat of it, &c.*
 || *In a Terrene Affair.*

"That the Apostle Paul did know the Mind of Christ, in that Precept, *Swear not at all*, is believed; but that he acted contrary thereto, after he said, *GOD is my Witness*, or, *Called GOD to Witness*, is denied, *Ibid.* p. 29, 30.

"And therefore the *Calling GOD to Witness*, or saying, *GOD is my Witness*, &c. without adding of *somewhat more*, is neither *Oath* nor *Swearing*. For if such *Attestations*, or mentioning the Name of *GOD*, without *somewhat more*, were *Swearing*; then it would follow, that People did *Swear* oftentimes in their *Prayers*: As when they use that Expression, *O God, the Father of Heaven, &c. O God, make hast to help us. Amen, Amen, &c.* which for any to affirm, were a great Injury to the People. Again, if a bare *Attestation of the Name of GOD*, by what Terms soever Express'd, were an *Oath* and *Swearing*, without adding of *somewhat more*; Then would the *Magistrates*, in *Judicial Proceedings*, in Cases where an *Oath* and *Swearing* is by the Law required, receive such *Attestations of the Name of GOD*, without denying them for *Oaths* and *Swearing*. But such *Attestations*, or the like, without adding *somewhat more*, is denied by the *Magistrates* in *Judicial Proceedings*. Therefore, they are no Formal or Legal *Oaths*, without addition of *somewhat more*; which *somewhat more*, being more than *Yea* and *Nay*, cometh of Evil, *Ibid.* p. 30, 31. What he means by the *somewhat more*, he tells us a little after: "An *Oath* (*said he*) is in, and of itself, a Distinct Thing from *Witness-bearing* (which was before any *Oath* was) and is but a *Bond* or *Tye* for true *Witness-bearing*, and not the Substance. For when the Evidence is given, if what is Evidenced be false, the *Oath* taken before or after, doth not make it true: And if it be *Truth* that is Evidenced, the refusing to take or add an *Oath*, or give a *Token*, *Sign* or *Pledge*, doth not detract any thing from it, *Ibid.* p. 32.

From

From whence it plainly appears, that *Attestations of the Name of God in Witness-bearing*, are no Oaths, without the Addition of a *Bond*, viz. Expressing an *Imprecation* or *Curse*, or using some outward *Token*, *Sign* or *Pledge*, implying it.

Again, in *A Second Testimony concerning Oaths and Swearing*, &c. Printed in the Year 1675. the said G. Benson saith, "There was and is a Diversity or Difference---- between an *Oath* or *Swearing*, and *Witness-bearing*, and the Holy Men of God did put a difference between them, p. 4. Then quoting Gen. 3. 3. where Eve before the Fall said, *God hath said, ye shall not eat*, &c. and Gen. 16. 5. where Sarah after the Fall said to Abraham, *The Lord judge between me and thee*; he proceeds to shew by several Instances that the Holy Men of God, in Causes where no Oath or Swearing was required by the Law, did in *Witness-bearing* call God to Witness, and used *Attestations of the Name of God*, when they did not Swear at all. "Moses called Heaven and Earth to Record, Deut. 4. 26. and 30. 19. Job said, *My Witness is in Heaven*, and *my Record is on High*, Job 16. 19. And the People of Israel, speaking to Jeremy, said, *The Lord be Witness of Truth and Faith (or, a True and Faithful Witness) between us*, Jer. 42. 5. The Prophet Micah also said, *Hear all ye People, Harken, O Earth, and all that therein is, and let the Lord God be Witness against you*, Mic. 1. 2. And the Prophet Malachi told the Priests and People of Jerusalem and Judah, that the Lord had been *Witness between them, and the Wife of their Youth*, Mal. 2. 14. From all which Testimonies (saith he) it is evident, that the Servants of the Lord, upon urgent Occasions, where no Oath was required by Law, did in *Witness-bearing*, Call God to Witness, and used *Attestations of the Name of God in Witness-bearing*, when they did not Swear at all. And for the farther manifesting of that part of my Affirmation, viz. That the Forms of Speech used

" used by *Jacob and Laban*, (*Gen. 31. 50. God is Wit-*
 " *ness betwixt me and thee*) and by the *Apostle*, (*God*
 " *is my Witness, &c.*) and others before-mentioned,
 " of themselves, without adding of *somewhat more*,
 " as an *outward Sign or Pledge*, are neither *Oaths* or
 " *Swearing*. It is worthy of *Observation*, that where
 " mention is made of an *Oath or Swearing* in the
 " *Scriptures of Truth*, there is also mention made of
 " some *outward Sign or Pledge*, which was added to
 " the *Form of Speech* by them used; which *some-*
 " *what more* being added, was that which gave the
 " *Denomination of an Oath or Swearing* to the *Forms*
 " of *Speech*, without which *Addition of somewhat*
 " *more than Yea and Nay*, as a *Sign or Pledge*, the
 " *Forms of Speech* of themselves were neither *Le-*
 " *gal Oath, or Swearing*, *Ibid. p. 4, 5.*

Again, " The Words, *God is Witness, &c.* of
 " themselves, neither were nor are either *Legal Oath*
 " or *Swearing*, or so intended or accepted by the
 " *Holy Men of God*, mentioned in the *Scriptures*
 " of *Truth*. Conform hereunto is the *Daily Pra-*
 " *ctice* observed in the *Courts of Judicature*, in this
 " and other *Nations*, when and where any *Oath* or
 " *Swearing* is required in *Witness-bearing*. — And
 " now, by what is before said, it is evident, that
 " the *Forms of Speech* used by *Jacob and Laban* in
 " their *Day*, and the *Forms of Speech* used by the
 " *Apostle Paul* in his *Day*, and now used by the
 " *People of God* called *Quakers*, in their *Witness-*
 " *bearing*, in and of themselves, neither were nor
 " are any *Legal Oath or Swearing*, *Ibid. p. 6.*

Again, " As in an *Oath* under the *Law*, the *Lord*
 " was called to *Witness* with the *Innocent Party*; so
 " under the *Gospel*, in *Witness-bearing*, the *Name of*
 " *God*, or *God Himself* is called to *Witness*; as,
 " where the *Apostle* saith, *God is my Witness; I call*
 " *God to Record upon my Soul, &c.* By which *Appeals*
 " unto *God* in *Witness-bearing* (without an *Oath*)
 " the *Power and Omniscency of Almighty God* is ac-
 " knowledged

“ knowledged, in discerning whether Truth be
 “ spoken, and in punishing them that Bear False
 “ Witness, as much as under the Law, in Cases
 “ where an Oath was required; and the Liar is ex-
 “ cluded the Kingdom of Heaven, as well as the False
 “ Swearer, Ibid. p. 9.

Note, How G. B. Distinguisheth between an Oath
 and Witness-bearing; and proves, that the Name of
 GOD was used by Eve in Witness-bearing before the
 Fall; and that after the Fall, Holy Men of God
 used Attestations of the Name of GOD in Witness-
 bearing, and that those Attestations of the Name of
 GOD neither were nor are, in and of themselves,
 Legal Oaths or Swearing, nor more than Yes and Nay:
 By which he clears the Holy Men of God under
 the Old Testament, and the Apostle Paul and the
 Quakers under the New, from Swearing in these
 Forms of Speech, viz. *God is my Witness; I call God
 to Record, &c.* which, he says, are no Oaths, unless
 somewhat more is added; by which he understands,
 an Imprecation expressed or understood, as his Words
 plainly intimate.

16. Stephen Crisp, in his Preface to his *Alarm*
Sounded in the Borders of Spiritual Egypt, &c. in the
 Year 1672. saith, “ Whereas the Words Govern-
 “ ment, Dominion, Reign and Kingdom, are often
 “ used [viz. in the *Alarm, &c.*] by which some
 “ of Perverse Minds may conclude, that I intend
 “ thereby the Overthrow, or Changing, or Sub-
 “ verting of Outward Government; to prevent such
 “ a Momus [or Carper] I do Declare in the Sight of
 “ GOD, and before all Men, that I have no such Thought
 “ or Intention; perfectly Declaring my Judgment,
 “ viz. That a Christian ought to live peaceably and
 “ quietly under all Sorts of Government, which the
 “ Lord permits to be, or is pleased to set up: And
 “ I do believe, that the Ruling or Government of
 “ an Emperor, King, Prince, or State, in it self, is
 “ not Repugnant to, but Consistent with the Govern-
 “ ment

ment of Christ, whose Kingdom is Spiritual. Works, p. 258, 259. Printed 1694.

Here he takes a Solemn Affirmation, in the Sight of Presence of God, to gain Credit to his Testimony in such a Civil or Terrene Affair, as Outward Government and Dominion.

In his Epistle of Tender Counsel and Advice, &c. in the Year 1680. Warning Friends to Watch against the Spirit of this World, &c. Ibid. p. 430. To have a care of suffering their Spirits to be sharpened and set on edge about these outward things; and to take heed of enlarging their Trades and Trafficks beyond their Ability, &c. Ibid. p. 431. He saith, "No Man knows the Issue before hand; and therefore, even in these things every one ought to wait to know the Guidance of the Lord, and to be Subject unto his Will, tho' in a Cross to their own; as the Apostle said, concerning them that said, *We will go to yonder City, and we will Buy and Sell, and get Gain:* which were all Lawful Things in themselves; yet for this, (saith he) "you ought to have said, *If the Lord will:* So he that saith, I will increase my Trade, and enlarge my Adventures, that my Gain may thereby be enlarged; Even in this, he ought to say, *If the Lord will,* Ibid. p. 431, 432.

Take notice, the Affairs he treats of, are of a Worldly or Terrene Nature, wherein he mentions the Sacred Name of God; not as some, who would endeavour to evade the Apostle's Words, by telling us, They have it upon their Minds, but expressing the very Phrase it self, *If the Lord will,* or that which is Equivalent thereunto; to manifest unto others our Christian Dependence upon, and Submission to the Will and Providence of God.

And having also seen a Paper of Stephen Crisp's Hand-writing, which contains the Substance of the Declaration of Fidelity, and of the Oath of Allegiance, I shall here transcribe it Verbatim, viz.

1. "I do Promise, *by the Assistance of the Grace of God*, to be True and Faithful to King *William* and Queen *Mary*, as becomes a Faithful Follower of Jesus Christ, that I may live a Peaceable Life under them, in all Godliness and Honesty.

2. "I *A. B.* do Unfeignedly Declare, that I have no Unity with the Church, nor See of *Rome*, nor with their Idolatrous Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, nor any other their Idolatrous Doctrines; neither do I believe, the Pope by himself, nor He with his *Clergy* and *Council*, have any just Power over *Princes* and *Potentates*, to *Excommunicate* them; or that they being by him or them *Excommunicate*, He or They have any just Power to Depose, Dethrone, or Hurt them, in *Person* or *Dignity*; or to Release or Discharge one, or any of their *Subjects* from their Obedience; or to exercise any *Power* or *Jurisdiction*, either *Spiritual* or *Temporal*, in this Kingdom of *England*, or the Territories thereunto belonging: *And this Declaration I do make in the Presence of God, the Searcher of Hearts*, in the plain Sense of the Words, without any Mental Reservation, or other Interpretation, than the Common Sense doth bear among *English* Protestants.

This Paper hath no Date, but by the Contents it seems to have been written about the time that *Friends* solicited in the Case of the *Toleration*, which was enacted into a Law in the First Year of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, 1689. and shews, that *S. C.* did not think, that to promise *by the Assistance of the Grace of God*, to be True and Faithful to King *William* and Queen *Mary*; And to declare in the Presence of God, the Searcher of all Hearts, against the Church or See of *Rome*, and their Idolatrous Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, and other their Idolatrous Doctrines, and against the *Popes* pretended Power to *Excommunicate* *Princes* and *Potentates*, or to Depose and Dethrone them, or to Release or Dis-

Discharge their Subjects from their Obedience, &c. was more than *Tea, Tea, and Nay, Nay*, which was, saith he, in *Epistle of Tender Counsel, &c. Works*, p. 432. *the Crown of our Profession*; --- and so it is still with all the Faithful Followers of the Truth. Our Ancient Friend, *John Feild*, who makes Honourable Mention of S.C.'s good Understanding, Wisdom, and Labours in the Gospel, see *Preface*, p. 3. saith, "He
 " was a Man that was Zealous for Truth, and the
 " several Testimonies it led us into; --- and often ex-
 " hortet Friends --- not to Boggle, or Decline their
 " Testimony for Truth, in any Respect; --- and greatly
 " disliked, that any Indirect Way should be complied
 " with by any, to Shift or Evade their Testimony for
 " the Truth, in any Respect, *Ibid.* p. 4. And having
 Commended the Author, he proceeds to Recommend
 his Writings to the Reader's Perusal, saying, "Let
 " us, that yet remain, be Faithful unto the Lord,
 " and freely given up to follow him, and to mani-
 " fest our Love and Respect unto our deceased Friend
 " and his Works, by following that *Wholesome Coun-
 " sel, and Christian Advice*, he hath by Word and
 " Writing, freely and frequently given us; that so
 " we may, by the same Spirit and Power, be enabled
 " to follow and succeed him in his Work and Ser-
 " vice for the Precious Truth, *Ibid.* p. 8, 9.

This was *J. Feild's* Testimony in the Year 1694. concerning *S. Crisp* (that Faithful Servant of God, as he truly styles him, *Ibid.* p. 5.) and of his Works. And yet S. C. was one that could and did Reverently Use the Name of God in a Solemn Affirmation in Terrene Affairs.

17. *John Banks*, in his Letter to *P. A.* and his Wife, in the Year 1671. writeth thus, "To Morrow, If
 " the Lord will, I intend for Wicklow the second time,
 " where I was taken Prisoner before. *Journal*, p. 50.
 Printed 1712.

In a Letter to his Wife, 1675. he saith, "To Mor-
 " row, If the Lord will, I go into the Country, but
 " must

* must return to this City [London] again, *Journal*, p. 56.

In another *Letter* to Her, the same Year, he saith,
 “ I can give thee no Account of my Return, for at
 “ present I do not see the End of my Journey; and
 “ so how the Lord will order me, as to that, I know
 “ not as yet, *Journal*, p. 58.

And in another *Letter* to Her, the same Year, he
 saith, “ I have passed through a Troublesome Coun-
 “ try here-a-ways, by wicked Informers, and other
 “ Officers; but the Lord hath so ordered it, by his
 “ Power, and in his Wisdom, that not any Friends
 “ have suffer’d Two Pence upon my Account, *Jour-
 nal*, p. 59.

Again, writing to her in the Year 1679. he saith,
 “ I intend, *If the Lord will*, to go from hence [Lon-
 “ don] “ to Morrow, and Travel down the Country
 “ towards Bristol, which may be One Month e’re I
 “ come there, *Journal*, p. 81.

Now these Forms of Speech, *If the Lord will*, *How
 the Lord will order me*, *The Lord hath so ordered it*,
 respecting his Journeying or Travelling from Place
 to Place, and Returning Home, all Temporal Mat-
 ters, shew, His Freedom, and consequently the Law-
 fulness of Using the Name of GOD in a Solemn Affir-
 mation in Terrene Affairs.

John Banks’s Journal is approved by these Friends,
 viz.

William Penn,	Elias Osborne,
John Whiting,	Abraham Thomas,
James Dickinson,	John Thomas,
Peter Fearon,	Samuel Bownas,
John Bowsted,	And many others,
Christopher Story,	whose Names I omit.

18. John Bolton and Samuel Newton, in a Certi-
 ficate under their Hands, in the Year 1673. to
 take off a Foul and False Charge, insinuated by the
 Author of the *Spirit of the Hat*, viz. That our Mini-
 stry

W. P. was guilty of Uncleanness, &c. have these Words,
 " We do Declare, in the Fear of the Everlasting God,
 " that tho' we Abhor with our whole Souls such
 " Unrighteous Practices; and if such things were,
 " we should, we hope, clear our Consciences for
 " God, and his Living Truth and People; yet we
 " do declare, in the Uprightness of our Hearts,
 " that we know of no such, nor can acknowledge
 " any such to be either of our Ministry, or our
 " Body; — *This in God's Fear we Testifie to the World.*
Joseph Wyeth's Switch for the Snake, p. 110. Printed
 1699.

19. *William Penn* in several of his Writings, in the Year 1673. frequently useth the Name of God, in Solemn Attestations, Invocations, Appeals and Affirmations; I shall present some of them to view, that the Reader may see, He was not against Solemn Affirming in Terrene Affairs, tho' he was against All Swearing.

In his *Invalidity of John Faldo's Vindication, &c.* Printed 1673.

J. F. " All this *Penn* knew to be true, when he
 " dared to make such Hypocritical Appeals, to de-
 " lude the World, save the Quakers Credit, and
 " abuse me as a Forger.

W. P. " *The Righteous God judge between us*, whe-
 " ther I writ otherwise than I knew, or he in Af-
 " firming it, more than he knew, *Ibid.* p. 157.

" I cannot but declare my Amazement, in calling
 " this Circumstantial Omission by no milder Name
 " than *Forgery*, who, *God is Record between us*, of
 " Fifty Testimonies, which he hath pretended to
 " take out of our Friends Writings, hath miscited
 " or misreported one half of them, and imposed
 " False Glosses upon the other, *Ibid.* p. 250.

In Vindication of his Father, he saith, " *I can say,*
 " and that with Sincerity to God and Man, that after
 " Twenty Five Years of Publick and very Eminent
 " Sea and Land Impleys, (requiring much Time, Pru-
 " dence

“ dence, Care, Faithfulness, Government) and the
 “ many great Opportunities he had to swell his
 “ Estate to a very considerable Bulk, and that as
 “ Laudably as any Publick Officers raise themselves,
 “ he departed this World with a most clear Con-
 “ science, in all those respects, leaving not Half
 “ that, which many London Shop-keepers arrive at
 “ by their Private Acquisitions, *Ibid.* p. 408.

“ J. P. charging him, That W. P. “ spit Defiance
 “ against the King’s Gracious Laws, and Act of
 “ Oblivion, &c. He replies, “ God forbid, and for-
 “ give him, *Ibid.*

“ W. P. in his *Reason against Railing, and Truth a-*
gainst Fiction; being an Answer to *Tho. Hicks’s Two*
Pamphlets, viz. A Dialogue between a Christian and
a Quaker, and the Continuation of the Dialogue, &c.
 Printed 1673. saith, “ What a Meeting here is of
 “ Ignorance, Malice and Lying? Anything to Spoil
 “ the *Quakers*: But God will break the Bow and Spear
 “ of their Enemies, *Ibid.* p. 51.

“ The Inventer of *Baxter Baptized in Blood* by
 “ *Anabaptists*, is nothing to this horrible kind of
 “ Perversion; and I doubt not, but T. Hicks’s Re-
 “ compence will be more terrible from the Hand of
 “ a Just God, irritated by such Irreligious Proceed-
 “ ings, *Ibid.* p. 61.

“ God Preserve us from that Dry Hireling Custom
 “ and Practice of *Tho. Hicks*, who will Avenge our
 “ Cause upon the Head of this Ungodly Slanderer, *Ibid.*
 p. 129.

“ God that made Heaven and Earth, will Recompence
 [viz. T. Hicks’s Perversions and Misrepresentations]
 “ into his Bosom, if he Repent not, *Ibid.* p. 153.

“ How honestly or worthily he [T. H.] hath
 “ dealt with us, is farther Evident, who brings in
 “ five of us, Fox, Dewsbury, Crisp, Whitehead, Penn,
 “ under suspicion of being *Wilful Lyars, &c.*

“ Ah! The God of Vengeance will Repay this Mur-
 “ dering, Wicked Spirit, that as greedily hunts after
 “ our

"our Ruin, as the Evening Wolf doth after the
"Prey, *Ibid.* p. 157.

"God's despised Light will Judge them [viz. the
"Anabaptists,] *Ibid.* p. 158. that is, if they do not
"Judge Hicks's Defamations.

W. P. having detected several of T. Hick's For-
geries, saith, "Thus, Reader, does this Ungodly
"Anabaptist (the Scandal of his Profession) treat us.

"We Charge it all with Forgery, in the Name of God,

"the Lord of Heaven and Earth, *Ibid.* p. 160.

"Here's your Anabaptist, a Preacher, a Perverter,
"a Forger, and a Profaner of Wholesome Words!

"Who moved him to this Ramance, but the Father

"of Lyes? What Quaker can this be, besides his; I

"mean, that Unchristian T. Hicks? God will avenge

"the Quakers Cause upon his Head, As sure as he is God,

"if he for these things Repent not, *Ibid.* p. 161.

Tho. Hicks brings in the Anabaptist Querying thus,

"Will you be so Liberal of your Revilings, whether

"your Adversaries give Occasion or no?

And then forges this Answer for the Quaker: "It

"concerns us to render them as Ridiculous as we

"can, and to make our Friends believe, they do no-

"thing but Contradict themselves: And if this

"fail, we will insinuate something by way of Que-

"stion, that may be Reproachful to them.

To which Notorious Forgery, W. P. replies,

"O Horrible Impiety! God, our God, Vindicate our

"Innocency from these Hellish Slanders. — I charge

"these things, with abundance more, relating to

"both our Doctrine and Practice, as Abominable

"Forgery. — And the Righteous God of Heaven and

"Earth will terribly plead our Cause in his Conscience,

"to his great Amazement, and perpetual Anguish,

"if he Repent not of these Undertakings, *Ibid.*

p. 161, 162.

"I warrant it from God, and by the Sense of his Eter-

"nal Spirit do declare, that it was the Portion, and

"only fit Answer to be given to those Trappanning

"Questions, *Ibid.* p. 164.

Note,

Note, He means E. Burroughs's Answer to Priest Benner's Questions, which were proposed not to be Inform'd, but to Ensnare.

"Tho' thou [T. Hicks] hast bestow'd much Time
 "to Abuse, Belye, Slander, and Traduce our Friends
 "in General, and my Self (a Stranger to thee) in
 "Particular; yet I can Forgive thee, and the Lord
 "is Record for me, I wish thy Salvation. O that these
 "heavy things might not be laid to thy Charge.
 "For, So sure as God Liveth, Great shall be the
 "Wrath that shall follow; yea, God will Visit for
 "these Unrighteous Dealings, Ibid. p. 180.

W. Penn's Christian Quaker, &c. Printed 1674.

Tho. Hicks, in his Abusive Catechism, thus Queries;

"Q. Then may not I conclude, that the Reason
 "why you so freely Rail against, and Reproach
 "your Opposers, is only to save your Credit with
 "your own Proselytes? Which he thus makes the Qua-
 "ker to Answer.

"A. I cannot deny, but that there may be some-
 "thing of that in it.

To which W. P. replies, "O Impudent Forgery!--
 "Our Witness is with God, as to our Innocency in this
 "Matter, Ibid. p. 5.

"To conclude his Slanders of this kind (saith
 W. P.) "hear him [viz. T. Hicks] once more.

"Q. Doth not W. P. in his Book against the Au-
 "thor of the Spirit of the Quakers tryed, manifest
 "great Displeasure against the Man for Concealing
 "his Name; Suggesting, that if he knew it, then
 "probably they might have something to detect
 "him? &c.

— "Observe the Man's Answer, which he would
 "have the World believe was ours.

"A. Whatsoever thou or others may think of
 "our Writings, we will give it out, that we have
 "both Answer'd and Confuted our Adversaries, and
 "our Friends will believe what we say in this Mat-
 "ter, and that is enough to us.

W. P. "O Lyes, Madneſs and Folly! ———

"In the Fear of Almighty God, we do Appeal to the
 "Conſciences of all People, that ſhall ever Read us,
 "whether we have been treated by this Man, in his
 "Dialogue and Catechiſm, with that Spirit of Meek-
 "neſs, Righteouſneſs and Truth, which is and ought
 "to be the Rule and Guide of Chriſtian Men in
 "their Undertakings, more eſpecially in and about
 "the very weighty Matters of Religion, *Ibid.* p. 6.

W. P.'s Answer to a Letter ſent to him, about his
 being a Papiſt or Jeſuite, &c. in the Year 1688.

"The Buſineſs (ſaith W. P.) chiefly inſiſted upon,
 "is my Popery, and Endeavours to promote it. I
 "do ſay then, and with all Sincerity, That I am
 "not only no Jeſuite, but no Papiſt. — And in the
 "Preſence of Almighty God, I do declare, That the
 "King [*viz.* James the Second] did never once,
 "Directly or Indirectly, Attack me, or Tempt me
 "on that Subject, *Ibid.* p. 12. in 8°. This Solemnity
 in Affirming was to gain Credit to what he ſaid.

W. P. in a little Tract, Intituled, *Sorrow and Joy*
in the Laſt and End of Springer Penn, his Eldeſt Son,
 among other Obſervations he made of his Words
 and Behaviour in his Sickneſs, gives us this Remark-
 able one, and very Pertinent to our preſent Purpoſe,
viz. That "Saying one Day thus, *I am reſolved I will*
"have ſuch a thing done; He immediately catch'd
 "himſelf, and fell into this Reflection, with much
 "Contrition, *Did I ſay, I will? O Lord, forgive me that*
"irreverent and haſty Expreſſion! I am a Poor Weak
"Creature, and Live by thee; and therefore I ſhould have
"ſaid, If it pleaſeth thee that I Live, I intend to do
*"ſo and ſo: Lord, forgive my Raſh Expreſſion, *Ibid.**
"p. 10. Springer Penn died in the Year 1696.

Which ſhews the Father's Senſe, as well as the Son's,
 that even in Terrene Affairs, we ought to Speak with
 Submission to the Will and Pleaſure of God, and not
 Reſolve or Intend any thing relating thereunto in
 our own Wills.

20. *Thomas Ellwood, in his Forgery no Christianity; or, A Brief Examen of a Book, Published by one T. Plant, a Baptist-Teacher, &c. Printed 1674. Speaking to him, and some other of the Baptists, saith,* "Touching our *Affenting*, that when we have done "with T. H. about Matters of Fact charg'd, and "that you have done us Justice therein, &c. we "should be willing, *If the Lord will*, as convenient "Opportunity may be afforded, to discourse Mat- "ters of Doctrine with some others of you, &c. "You unreasonably quarrel with the Words [*As* "convenient Opportunity may be] as signifying our "Common Way of Trifling, as you falsely and scorn- "fully say; whereas we seriously expressed our "real Intentions and Desires therein, as not ha- "ving Time and Convenient Opportunity in our Hands "to Command, that being in the Hands of an Om- "niscient God, whom we Fear, and in Subjection to "whose Will, we propose Matters, that are not in "our present Time to be done, p. 91, 92.

Here T. E. useth a Solemn Affirmation in a Ter-
rene or Temporal Affair, *We should be willing, If the*
Lord will; for tho' the Subject-Matter to be dis-
coursed upon was Doctrine, yet he applies the
Words, *If the Lord will*, to Time and Convenient
Opportunity, which are Temporal Things, and
not in our Hands, but in the Hand and Disposal
of an Omniscient God.

His Answer to George Keish's Narrative of his
Proceedings at Turners-Hall, 1696.

G. K. having charged W. P. with Swearing, when
he said to Tho. Hicks, *So sure as God Liveth, great*
will be the Wrath that will follow, &c. Reason against
Railing, p. 180. T. E. Answers, "This I take to be
"a meer Cavil, and a very Weak one too. For,
"first, That Form of Speech (*As the Lord Liveth*)
"tho' it was sometimes used among the Jews of Old
"as an Oath, [that is, when an Imprecation was ex-
pressed, or necessarily understood] "yet it was not al-
ways

“ says so ; nor do I think G. Keith will take it to
 “ be intended for an Oath, in all those Places, where
 “ he reads it in the Bible ; as particularly in 1 Sam.
 “ 25. 26. where Abigail used it to David concern-
 “ ing his Enemies. See also Chap. 26. 10. and Chap.
 “ 29. 6. 1 King. 17. 12. and 18. 10. 2 King. 2. 2, 4, 6.
 “ and Chap. 4. 30. Job 27. 2. with many other Places
 “ in the Books of Samuel and the Kings, where it
 “ is used sometimes singly [*As the Lord liveth*]
 “ sometimes with this Addition [*And as thy Soul*
 “ *liveth ;*] yea, and sometimes, this latter Expres-
 “ sion, [*As thy Soul liveth*] is used without the
 “ former, as in 1 Sam. 1. 26. and 17. 55. 2 Sam. 11.
 “ 11. and 14. 11, 19. yet neither with it, nor with-
 “ out it, was intended for an Oath.

Secondly, “ There is a difference between those
 “ two Forms of Speech, [*As the Lord liveth*] and
 “ [*So sure as God liveth*] for tho’ the former was
 “ formerly used as an Oath [*When an Imprecation*
 “ *was expressed or necessarily understood*] “ yet the latter
 “ was never so used or taken ; but is only a Perswa-
 “ sive Form of Speech, used to set forth the Unquesti-
 “ onable Certainty of the thing delivered, from the
 “ Acknowledged Certainty that God Lives. In which
 “ Sense, and no other, it is evident W. Penn there
 “ used it, p. 216, 217.

So that T. E. is positive in his Judgment, that
 tho’ this Form of Speech, or Solemn Affirmation,
 [*As the Lord liveth*] was sometimes used among the
 Jews of Old, as an Oath, (that is, when an Impreca-
 tion was expressed or necessarily understood,) yet it was
 not always so, (that is, when no Imprecation was ex-
 pressed or necessarily understood ;) And that the other
 Form of Speech, or Solemn Affirmation, [*So sure as*
God liveth] was never used or taken for an Oath.
 And if never so used or taken, then it could not be
 an Oath in Terrene Affairs, but might be lawfully
 used therein.

21. *Roger Haydock*, in the Copy of his Answer, tendred to the Chancellor, in the Consistory Court at York, the 23d of the 2d Month, called *April*, (no Year to it, but it Being placed in the *Collection*, &c. Printed 1700. between two Dates of 1675. 'tis probable it was written the same Year) saith,

"I therefore Affirm, I have done nothing out of
 "Malice to *Ralph Briddock* [viz. *Bishop of Chester*]
 "in Appealing to you, nor is there any Malice in
 "my Heart against him; the Cause why I Appealed,
 "was, that I, who had suffered Nine Months Impri-
 "sonment in *Lancaster Goal*, for disobeying (as say
 "the Words of my *Mittimas*) the Process of the
 "Ecclesiastical Court of *Chester*, might come to Trial,
 "that the Truth might appear, I knowing my self
 "to be clear; for I never saw, nor had knowledge
 "of any Process; and that I might be quit of the
 "Injury done me by *Ralph Briddock*, who sued and
 "imprisoned me, because another Man would not
 "pay *Tithes* (can the like be parallell'd?) I having no
 "Corn of my own, nor any liable within his Pre-
 "cincts. And also of the Injustice done me by the
 "Illegal Proceedings of the Bishop's Court at *Chester*,
 "who decreed me guilty of Contumacy, wherein
 "I had not offended, as was clear by the Records of
 "that Court; whereupon my Appeal was admitted:
 "This was the very Cause of my Appealing; and
 "therefore I do desire Justice at your Hands, which
 "if you do refuse to do me, I Appeal to the Righteous
 "Judge, the Lord of Heaven and Earth, to plead my
 "innocent Cause. *Collection*, p. 183, 184.

Roger Haydock, *Heskin Pell* and *Alice Haydock*, in their Letter to the Bishop of *Chester*, in the Year 1676. write thus,

"If a Bishop should bite with his Teeth, and prepare
 "War against an Innocent People, because they can-
 "not pour into his Mouth, and cast them into Pri-
 "son (some of which neither owe him any thing,
 "either according to the Law of God, or any Law
 "of

" of Man, as is known to some of his Agents: The
 " like of which, I think, cannot be parallell'd by all
 " the *Impropriators and Priests in England*: Besides, yet
 " done by, or at least in the Name, and at the Suit
 " of the Bishop) and threatens the *Jaylor* with severe
 " Punishment, if he suffer them to have any Liberty
 " at all; and likewise stir up the Judge to Straiten
 " their Bonds, that if possible, he might have the
 " Lives of such, for whom *Christ* died, and bring the
 " Guilt of their Blood upon his Head:

" I say, if a Bishop have thus done, I Query, whe-
 " ther this be the way for such a Bishop to stand ap-
 " proved in the Sight of God, and to be manifest to
 " the Conscience of all People, and to have a good
 " Report of them which are without; or, rather
 " the way to fall into Reproach, and the Snare of the
 " Devil, and bring the Wrath and Judgment of God
 " upon his Head?

" So let the *Witness of God in thy Conscience*, answer
 " to these things: And the Lord God of Heaven and
 " Earth, the Righteous Judge of all the Earth, whose
 " Judgment is just, Judge betwixt thee and us: And
 " unto him we Appeal, with whom there is no Respect
 " of Persons; who judgeth the Cause of the Poor,
 " and the Cause of the Rich; and to his Faithful
 " Witness in thy Conscience, we also Appeal in this Mat-
 " ter, whether it be not more Christian-like, more
 " according to Truth, the Example of *Christ* and
 " his Apostles, who gave Commandment unto the
 " Church, That they should walk, as they had them for
 " Examples in *Christ*, which all true Christians ought
 " to follow, To set us at Liberty, than to keep us Pri-
 " soners until Death, (having, contrary to the Law,
 " ensnared us) and bring the Guilt of
 " Innocent Blood upon || his Head? || *Thy or Thine*
 " rather.

Ibid. p. 195, 196.

Will any of the *Dissatisfied Friends* say, That
 Roger Haydock, that Faithful and Approved Mini-
 ster of Jesus Christ, as the Title Page to his *Collections*
 faith

faith of him, transgress'd his Master's Precept? Will they say, that he Swore, or Took the Lord's Name in Vain, whom John Feild, John Haydock, Robert Haydock, Gilbert Thompson, Thomas Camm, William Ellis, with many more, so much Commend for his Faithful Testimony to the Truth? And yet he used the Sacred Name of God to gain Credit to his Speech in a Terrene Affair: He Appealed to the Righteous Judge, the Lord of Heaven and Earth.

Again, He, with Heskin Fell and Alice Haydock, Appealed to the Lord of Heaven and Earth, the Righteous Judge of all the Earth, to Judge betwixt [Ralph Bridgock, the Bishop of Chester] and Them, whether it be not more Christian-like to set them at Liberty, than to keep them Prisoners until Death. And was not this in a Temporal Matter, wherein they thus Solemnly Appealed? Let the Essayer, or any of his Friends, deny it if they can.

It follows therefore, that they must either Condemn R. Haydock for Swearing, or Taking the Lord's Name in Vain, in his using the Solemn Forms aforesaid; or Acknowledge, that those Solemn Forms, by him used in a Terrene Affair, were his Tea and Nay. For 'tis plain, from his Words, Coll. p. 183. which is quoted before, Sect. V. p. 37. that he made no Medium between Swearing, and Tea or Nay.

To use then an Argument *ad Hominem*: If they will say, He Swore, (tho' 'tis certain he did not) in using those Solemn Appeals to God in Terrene Affairs, which are Printed without any Censure upon them in his Book; then how will those Friends be cleared of bearing False Witness, who have, as I said, so much commended him for his Faithful Testimony to the Truth, a Branch whereof is *Not Swearing*? But if the Essayer and his Party will say, that R. H.'s Solemn Appeals to God in Terrene Affairs were Tea and Nay, then, if they will be Ingenuous, they ought to Confess their Mistake, and Give up the Cause of the Solemn Affirmation.

22. *George Fox and John Burnyeat*, in their *New-England Fire-Brand Quenched*, &c. Printed in the Year 1679. mention the Name of God in a *Solemn Affirmation in Terrene Affairs*.

Roger Williams says, "He sent his Proposals to G. F. to Newport; and yet, p. 4. says, He sent them to the Deputy-Governour *Cranston*."

Answ. "How darest thou, *Roger Williams*, Publish such *False Lyes* to the World, when thou knowest in thy Conscience, that G. F. had never any *Writing*, or *Letter*, or *Proposals* from thee, neither did he ever exchange a Word with thee. *The Lord God of Heaven* knows it, and the Deputy-Governour knows, that I received none of thy Writings, or Papers of Proposals by him. — *The Lord God*, which knows them, [viz. *Thy Lyes and False Charges*] "and sees thy Evil Design in them, will sweep them away with the Besom of Destruction, and clear his People from thy manifest False Tongue, *Ibid.* Part 1. p. 2.

R. W. says, p. 4, 5. "That it was Concluded and Agreed in a *Juncto* at Newport, that his Letter should not be delivered to the Deputy-Governour, until G. F. was gone."

Answ. "This also is an Abominable Falshood, *The Lord* knows it; — for there was no such Agreement or Consultation. — It seems but Reasonable, that he should have written to G. F. as well as to the Deputy-Governour, if he had a mind that G. F. should have seen it: But *the Lord*, who is over all, knows and sees his Creeping and Lying Spirit, *Ibid.* p. 3.

Again, "These be all Horrid Lyes, *The Lord God* knows, as *W. Edmundson* and *John Burnyeat*, and the rest that were there know, that there was no such Agreement. *Ibid.* p. 18.

Of G. F.'s Freedom to Declare in the Presence of God in a Terrene Affair, which he esteemed not of an Higher Strain than Yea and Nay; see the Epistle from the

the Meeting for Sufferings, p. 6, 7. and the Letter from a Satisfied to a Dissatisfied Friend, p. 7.

23. Thomas Taylor, in the Year 1679. gave forth a *Solemn Declaration*, to clear himself from that wicked Aspersions of his being a Jesuite, and from Popery, &c. as followeth;

" I Thomas Taylor, do in the Presence of Almighty
 " God, Solemnly Profess, and in Good Conscience Declare,
 " It is my Real Judgment, that the Church of Rome
 " is not the Church of Christ, nor the Pope or Bishop
 " of Rome Christ's Vicar; and that His or Her Do-
 " ctrine of Deposing Heretical Princes, and Absol-
 " ving their Subjects of their Obedience; of Purga-
 " tory, and Prayers for the Dead; of Indulgences, and
 " Worshipping of Images; of Adoring and Praying
 " to the Virgin Mary, and other Saints deceased;
 " And of Transubstantiation, or Changing the Ele-
 " ments of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood
 " of Christ, at or after the Consecration thereof, by
 " any Person whatsoever, are False, Erroneous, and
 " Contrary to the Truth of God declared in the
 " Holy Scriptures: And therefore the Communion of
 " the said Church is Superstitious and Idolatrous.

" And I do likewise Sincerely Testifie and Declare,
 " that I do from the Bottom of my Heart, Detest
 " and Abhor All Plots and Conspiracies, that are or
 " may be Contrived against the King, Parliament,
 " or People of this Realm: And I do hereby Faith-
 " fully Promise, with God's Help, to Live a Sober
 " and Peaceable Life, as becometh a good Christian
 " and Protestant to do. And all this I do Acknow-
 " ledge, Intend, Declare and Subscribe, without
 " any Equivocation or Mental Reservation, according
 " to the True Plainness, Simplicity, and Usual Sig-
 " nification of the Words.

Witness my Hand,

Stafford, the 7th of
 the 4th Mo. 1679.

Thomas Taylor.

Which

Which Declaration is the same *Verbatim* with that Printed in *Ellis Hookes's Truth Seeks no Corners*, p. 6, 7, in the Year 1679. and Signed by him the 7th of the 3d Month, ditto, in the Name, and on the Behalf of the People called *Quakers*; with this Title, *A Protestation or Declaration to Distinguish Protestant Dissenters from Popish Recusants*; and the same for Substance with that other Declaration or Test, to Distinguish Protestant Dissenters from Papists and Popish Recusants, which our Friends agreed to Instead of the Oath of Allegiance, and deliver'd to the Parliament in the Year 1680. See *Epistle from the Meeting for Sufferings*, p. 21, 22.

In *Thomas Taylor's Account* of what passed at the Assizes in *Stafford*, betwixt the Judge, and the People of God, called by the World *Quakers*, in the Year 1662. "The Oath of Allegiance being read, he thus Answered, "It seems this Oath was made against them called *Papists*. And as for *Papery*, I do here Declare, *As in the Presence of the Lord*, against it, and their wicked Tenents, such as there is mentioned. And for our good Desires for the King, and all Men, is in like Sincerity [*viz. in the Presence of God*] also now acknowledged. This is, as it were, the Substance of the Oath, said the Judge.

"Then, said I, let that Serve.

"Judge. But why will you not Swear?

"*Ans.* Because my *Yea* is *Yea*, and my *Nay* is *Nay*, without Swearing. And I do not deny to Swear [*Allegiance*] in Contempt of Authority, but in Conscience to God. His Works, Intituled, *Truth's Innocency and Simplicity*, &c. p. 132. Printed 1697.

Note, He makes no *Medium* between Swearing, and *Yea* and *Nay*; nor any Difference between *Yea* and *Nay*, and *Declaring in the Presence of the Lord* in a Civil or Terrene Affair.

Again, "I was called, saith he, certain Honrs
 "after up to the Bar, and then was that Wicked
 "Thing, called an *Indictment*, framed and brought
 "in against me. O what Unchristian and Unfavoury
 "Things was it fraught with! as tho' I had Wick-
 "edly and Contemptuously denied to take that Oath
 "called *Allegiance*, which was made against *Papists*
 "and *Gunpowder-Plotters*: When, as the Lord Knows,
 "I denied only to Swear in Obedience to Christ,
 "who saith, *Swear not at all*; and so to keep my
 "Conscience Pure to God in the thing, I denied to
 "Swear, and neither in Favour of *Popery*, nor in
 "Opposition to the King, as I had Declared before,
 [viz. *As in the Presence of the Lord*] "from the Truth
 "of my Heart, and the Judge himself was once made
 "to acknowledge it, as is said before; yet because
 "I could not Lay my Hand on a Book, and Kiss it,
 "and so commit *Idolatry*, and because I could not
 "say, *I Swear, I Swear*, or so; they proceeded to
 "bring in Sentence against me, as if I had been the
 "greatest Offender in this Case that might be; even
 "to the Confiscation of all in the Outward World
 "called mine, whether *Lands, Leases, Goods, Chat-*
 "*tels, and Liberty*; Tho' in the Sight of God, and
 "that Just and Righteous Reasonable Principle of God
 "in every Man, I stand Clear, which is my Joy,
Ibid. p. 134.

"And so after they had read that Wicked Instru-
 "ment, called an *Indictment*, some Words passed
 "from me in the Dread of the Lord; as first, I Declared
 "my Innocency there, as to the Thing charged upon me
 [viz. in the *Indictment*] "in the Sight of the Lord God,
 "and all Men; and so Warned the Judge to take
 "heed what he did against an Innocent Man, &c.
Ibid. p. 134.

Observe from hence, that T. Taylor's Expressions,
 viz. *The Lord Knows*; *In the Sight of God*, &c. *I stand*
Clear; *I declared my Innocency in the Sight of the Lord*
God, were Solemn Affirmations made in a Court of Ju-
 dicature,

dicature, to Purge himself from the Suspicion of Popery, and Opposition to the King, which were Civil or Terrene Affairs; and that what he was against of the Oath of Allegiance, was the Laying his Hand on a Book, and Kissing it, and saying, I Swear; not against the Substance of the Oath, but the Formalities, and the Swearing, in which the Imprecation or Curse is contained.

So in the Relation he gives of his being taken Prisoner, in the Year 1663. he saith, "As I was on my Journey with my Wife into Worcester-shire, to see a Son we had Apprentice there, — Two Men, called Justice Layn, and Justice Pierchouse, being put upon (it seems by a wicked Man) came upon me, as I was standing without the Door of a House at Tipton-Green, — and laid Violent Hands upon me, and caused a Constable to Search me, as tho' I had been some Dangerous Person, when, As the Lord knows, I bore no Carnal Weapons for this Four and Twenty Years space. Works, p. 147.

Certainly Carnal Weapons were Terrene Affairs, and yet T. Taylor Solemnly Declares, As the Lord Knows, I bore no Carnal Weapons for this Four and Twenty Years space.

In the Title-Page of his Works, he is stiled, That Ancient and Faithful Minister and Servant of Jesus Christ, and highly Commended and Approved for his Service, Labours and Travels in the Gospel of Christ,

by

Theodore Eccleston,

Thomas Lower,

William Ellis,

John Bowater,

* Samuel Waldenfeild,

Joshua Middleton,

* George Bowles,

Richard Needham,

Charles Marshal,

* John Feild.

And by George Fox, Christopher Taylor, Thomas Taylor Junior, and Hannah Taylor (Son and Daughter to the said Thomas Taylor, Robert Barrow, William Fallowfield, and Mary Comberford, as appears by their Testimonies prefix'd to T. T's Works.

24. *George Whitehead*, who was early Convinced of the *Blessed Truth*, and hath been Enabled by the Grace of God, and Preserved by his Power, to bear a Constant Faithful Testimony thereunto, the Lord having Endued him with a Good Understanding and Sound Judgment in the Truth, and with a Godly Zeal, Christian Wisdom and Courage, for the Maintaining and Defending of it, against all Opposers, whether *Private* or *Publick*, whether *with-in* or *without* the Pale of our Society, did in the Year 1679. manifest both *His* and *Our* Clearness, as a People, from *Popery*, by Printing the *Protestation*, or *Declaration*, to Distinguish *Protestant Dissenters* from *Popish Recusants*, (as before, p. 112.) in his *Introductory Epistle* to the *Real Quaker a Real Protestant*, p. 9, 10. which begins thus, *I A. B. do in the Presence of Almighty God, Solemnly Profess, and in Good Conscience Declare.*

And at the Tryal of *G. Whitehead* and *Thomas Burr*, at the Quarter-Sessions for the City and County of *Norwich*, the 28th Day of *April*, so called, 1680. they being asked by the Recorder, "Will you take the Oath? [viz. of Allegiance]" *G. W.* Answered, "We have a *Protestation* or *Declaration* against the Pope and *Popery*, which was deliver'd to the Committee of Parliament, and thereby judged Sufficient to Distinguish us from *Popish Recusants*: We crave Leave of the Court to Read it."

Which the Court Consenting to, the *Protestation* was Read, being the same as above. See *G. W's Due Order of Law and Justice*, &c. p. 27, 28. Printed 1680.

And having mentioned several *Wicked Positions* and *Practices* of the *Papists*, viz.

"Of *Deposing* or *Murthering Kings* and *Princes* Excommunicated by the *Pope*.

"Of *Disposing* of their *Kingdoms*, *Dominions* and *Countries*.

"Of *Authorizing Foreign Princes* to *Inva*de and *An*noy them.

" Of Absolving Subjects from their Allegiance and Obedience.

" Of Licensing any of them to bear Arms, raise Tumults, or offer Violence or Hurt to their Lawful Kings, Princes, Governours or Subjects.

" Of Treasons, Traiterous Conspiracies, and Hellish Plots against King, Government, Parliament or People.

" Of that Damnable Position, That Princes that be Excommunicated or Deprived by the Pope, may be Deposed by their Subjects, or any other.

G. W. saith, " All which Destructive Principles and Abominable Practices, together with that Antichristian Spirit from whence they proceed, We do in Good Conscience, and in the Sight and Presence of God, who Knows our Hearts, utterly Abhor, Protest, and Testifie against them; and therefore do neither Refuse nor Scruple the said Oath, in Favour to those, or any such Principles.

" What's now wanting, why we must be run to Premunire, to lose our Estates and Liberties? Is a Peaceable Conversation wanting on our parts? No. Is the Duty of Allegiance towards our King wanting? No. Are we infected with Popish, Treacherous, Treasonable, or Destructive Principles against our King, or his Government, or People? No; God Knows the Innocency of our Hearts and Intentions, and Men know our Peaceable Conversations, *Ibid.* p. 81.

" An Innocent, Honest, Quiet and Well-meaning Man, both towards the King, his Government and People; he's truly Principled in his Duty; he's Real and Honest in his Heart towards his Protestant Prince; he's a Real Protestant against the Pope, and all Popish, Antichristian Positions, and Destructive Practices; he not only performs his Duty of Allegiance in his Peaceable Conversation, but also Declares it in the Sight of God and Men, and is Willing to Sign and Subscribe such Declaration of his Duty of Allegiance, if he may not otherwise be
" believed,

“believed, only he Conscientiously Scruples to say,
 “*I Swear, and to Kiss the Book, to make his Decla-*
 “*ration an Oath; for want only of which Circum-*
 “*stance [viz. saying, I Swear] and Ceremony [viz.*
 “*Kissing the Book]* “this poor Innocent Man and Sin-
 “*cere Protestant, must be run to a Premunire, his*
 “*Liberty lost, and the little Estate or Substance he*
 “*has must be forfeited, and all taken from him, &c.*
 “*—We can Appeal to God, Angels, and all Just Im-*
 “*partial Men, this is our Case, Ibid. p. 82.*

“Let the Law of Truth, Justice, Equity and Con-
 “science, in all Moderate Magistrates and Impartial
 “Men, Judge in this our Case; for to that we Ap-
 “peal, and not to the Spirit of Persecution, Envy,
 “Revenge and Partiality, which (without any due
 “Measure of Things, and without all Compassion)
 “seeks Occasion against us to destroy us, which the
 “*Righteous God, and Just Judge of Heaven and Earth,*
 “*will Plead with and Judge, Ibid. p. 85.*

“We use no Pretence of Tender Conscience for
 “any such Wicked End or Design [*viz. to Contrive*
 “*Insurrections]* “*The All-seeing and Heart-searching*
 “*GOD knows our Innocence and Clearness herein,*
 “*Ibid. p. 95.*

And forasmuch as our *Dissatisfied Friends* are so
 Unhappy as to fall in with *John Pennyman*, and his
 Abettors, in his Malicious Book, Intituled, *The Qua-*
kers Unmask'd, wherein he falsely Accuseth them with
 several Forms of OATHS among themselves, one
 whereof he places in these Words, *viz. I do hereby*
Testifie in the Truth of my Heart, and in the Presence
of Him that knows all things, &c. I shall desire the said
Dissatisfied Friends to Weigh and Consider what *G. W.*
 hath (in his Book, Intituled, *Christ's Lambs Defended*
from Satan's Rage, &c. Printed in the Year 1691.) re-
 turned in Answer, p. 39, 40.

“As to the Words [*One of the Forms of the Quakers*
 “*Oaths]* This is (*said G. W.*) a deceitful Aspersion,
 “containing a twofold Falshood;

“1. That

" 1. That the *Quakers* do use *Oaths* or *Swearing*;
 " 2. That they use several *Forms* of *Swearing*, &c.
 He further Answers J. P. &c. " That the Apo-
 " stle's Words were but *Asseverations*; see the Testi-
 " monies in our *Treatise of Oaths*; of *Basil*, *Naxian-*
 " *zen*, &c. p. 61, 65, 18. Bp. *Sanderson de Jur. Oblig.*
 " (*Engl. Edit.*) p. 169, 172, 173. and others there.
 " Besides, we have more fully defined an *Oath*, and
 " the particular Ceremonies thereof, than what our
 " Adversary cites amounts to, in our Book, in An-
 " swer to J. S. Intituled, *The Case of the Quakers*
 " concerning *Oaths* *Defended as Evangelical*; as first,
 " concluding, That only saying, *God is my Witness*,
 " *Rom. 1. 9. I say the Truth in Christ, I lye not, Rom.*
 " *9. 1. And Calling God to Witness to the Truth of what*
 " *I say*, &c. are no *Oaths*: We cannot be convinced
 " that any of these make up a *Formal Oath* among
 " Christians. And then we give the *Definition* of
 " an *Oath*, as used among Men, viz. That, 1. There
 " is *Swearing by the Great God* intended. 2. An Im-
 " precation or *Curse* contained. 3. Some *Ceremony* or
 " *Sign* used. See the *Case of the Quakers concerning*
 " *Oaths Defended*, p. 6.

" And then for the several Ways and Ceremonies
 " expressing *Formal Swearing*, they are signified thus,
 " viz. Among the Heathen, *Laying the Hands upon*
 " *the Altar*, and *Swearing by the Gods*; *Jurare Aras*,
 " *Horace*. *Abraham's Servant* putting his Hand un-
 " der his Thigh, *Gen. 24. 2. and 47. 29.* The *Angel*
 " *lifting up his Hand towards Heaven.* The *Professed*
 " *Christian's Laying the Hand upon a Bible*, and *Kis-*
 " *sing it*; or, *Swearing upon the Four Evangelists*, ac-
 " cording to the *Pope's Imposition*, p. 7, &c.

" And every Engagement that Men make under
 " Hand and Seal (tho' God's Name be mentioned
 " therein) is not therefore an *Oath*: For, are the
 " *Last Wills and Testaments* of the Deceased, *Oaths* or
 " *Swearing*; which are made and begun, *In the Name*
 " *of God, Amen*, and confirm'd with *Hand and Seal*?

" Are

" Are these *Oaths*, or esteemed the *Oaths* of the De-
 " ceased (or Sworn by them) because mention is made
 " of the *Name of God*, and *Hand and Seal* to them?
 " If *Hand and Seal* to any *Contract or Promise*, where-
 " in possibly some Occasionally have made mention
 " of the *Name of God*, (which we are very tender of
 " using) make this an *Oath*; I confess, it is a *New De-*
 " *finition of an Oath*. And he that assisted *J. P.* in
 " this Accusation, and other Notes, Observations,
 " and most Unjust Inferences against us, may very
 " well be ashamed of such Malicious Work, and of
 " his Abetting him therein, &c.

Moreover, our said Friend *G. Whitehead*, in his
Some Reflections on some Remarks, &c. in Print, dated
 the 1st of the 6th Month, 1691. gives this Answer to
John Pennyman, and other Adversaries, viz. p. 7.

" I am not convinced by what *J. P.* and his Re-
 " marker say, That the Quakers are mistaken about
 " the Nature of an Oath: Let's a little Examine his
 " Definition of an Oath; He tells us, That he that
 " Falsifies in the Presence of God, calling him to Wit-
 " ness, incurs the greatest Punishments of Divine Ven-
 " geance, as one that makes God a Partner to a Lye.
 " And what's the Consequence? Therefore calling
 " God to Witness is as much an Oath, as any other Form
 " of Words. And so to Testifie the Truth in the Pre-
 " sence of Him that knoweth all things; or to say, God
 " is my Witness; I call God to Record on my Soul;
 " The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ
 " knows I lye not, &c. (as Paul the Apostle declared.)
 " These he calls *Forms of an Oath*: Wherein I think
 " the Remarker is mistaken.

" For, 1. No Falsifying whatsoever, tho' in an Un-
 " sworn Testimony, can be excluded either the Sight
 " or Presence of an Omnipresent God; He is really
 " All-seeing, and Present every where, even among
 " False Witnesses, a swift Witness against them.

" 2. If any will Falsifie in an Unsworn Testimony,
 " if it be but his bare *Yea or Nay*, without any

" * Affe-

" * *Asseveration*, and would have it accepted on the
 " Credit of his Religion or Christianity, he does
 " as really make Christ or God a Partner to a Lye,
 " as he that expressly saith, *I Speak in the Presence*
 " *of God*; or, *God is Witness*, &c. (Is there no Dif-
 " ference between *Asseveration* and *Imprecation*?)
 " and as much incurs the Penalty of Divine Ven-
 " geance, by *Falsifying his Unsworn Testimony*.

" 3. *God is truly Witness* to every Truth sincerely
 " declared, whether we call him to *Witness* there-
 " unto, or not; so he is *Witness* against every Lye,
 " and *False Testimony*, tho' it be *Unsworn*, and is as
 " Punishable by him. If all Lyes be excluded the
 " *Holy City*, and the *Lake* that burns must be their
 " Punishment; what greater Punishment is there
 " for *False Swearers*? Are all Lyes therefore Oaths?
 " No sure; tho' every *false Oath* be a Lye, yet every
 " Lye is not an Oath.

" 4. The Remarker's Description of an Oath re-
 " flects on the Apostle Paul for *Swearing*, and using
 " several *Forms of Oaths* in his *Epistles* to the Churches
 " of Christ, as if they were so Incredulous, as not
 " to believe his *Christian Testimony*, without using
 " several *Forms of Oaths*, or without breaking Christ's
 " Command, and his Apostle James's Exhortation
 " against all *Swearing*, Mat. 5. Jam. 5. We'll rather
 " believe, that the Apostles of Christ observed his
 " Doctrine, *not to Swear*, than that they, contrary
 " therunto, did *Swear several Forms of Oaths*; for
 " God being *Witness* to every Testimony of Truth,
 " tho' *Unsworn*, I cannot apprehend, that simply
 " *Declaring*, either in the *Presence of God*, or that
 " *God is Witness to the Truth declared*, can be either
 " an Oath, or the Form of an Oath, without some
 " *Imprecation* or *Curse*, or *Invoking of God to Ven-*
 " *geance Conditionally contained, or included in the Form*

* ASSEVERATIONS are either with or without the Name of God;
 G. W.'s Words are to be understood according to the first Accepta-
 tion.

“ of an Oath; and is there not also some Overt Act
 “ or Ceremony required in a Formal Oath, and done
 “ by him that Swears? ”

“ For farther Answer in this Case, I refer the
 “ Reader to a Book, Intituled; *The Case of the Qua-*
 “ kers concerning Oaths Defended as Evangelical, by
 the said G. W. Printed Anno 1675. ”

Wherein this our *Ancient and Eminent Friend* hath
 so exactly Discussed this Point, and Stated it ac-
 cording to the Holy Scriptures, that if contrary
 Prepossessions have not Blinded the Understanding,
 and Byassed the Judgment, the most Scrupulous may
 receive Satisfaction.

25. *A Faithful Testimony, from the Peaceable People,*
called Quakers, in the Counties of Somerset, Devon
and Dorset, upon Occasion of the late Insurrection and
Rebellion, [viz. of the Duke of Monmouth in the
Year 1685.] Humbly Presented to Authority, and
Signed in the Behalf of the said People in the Coun-
ties aforesaid, by

William Lawrence,	Thomas Martin,
William Reeve,	Thomas Combe,
Manasseh Orchard,	Jasper Batt,
Roger Brown,	Thomas Bagg,
John Gannicliff,	Humphry Sprague,
William Gravett,	Edward Collyer,
John Colesworthy,	Samuel Sprake,
John Chappel,	*John Nicolls,
Robert Ford,	William Ellet,
Peter Leman,	William Ferris,
John Smith,	Edward Gunning,
Thomas Powell,	William Smith, Junr.
Richard Lincoln,	Robert French.
John Hopkins,	

In which Testimony, the said Friends, to man-
 fest their Peaceable Subjection, as a Christian So-
 ciety and People, to the Government, and those
 Governours which it had pleased God to set over
 them; to the King, as Supream, and those in Au-
 thority,

thority under him; and to Testifie against all *Plotting, Sedition, Contriving or Assisting*, in any *Insurrection or Rebellion*; and particularly against having any Hand in the *Duke of Monmouth's Insurrection*, make use of some of the very Words mentioned in the *Solemn Affirmation*, and others that do Import the Sense of the rest. The *Testimony* being large, I shall only cite so much of it, as relates to the present Occasion, out of *Joseph Wyeth's Anguis Flagellatus*; or, *A Switch for the Snake*, Printed 1699.

"We, say they, whose Names are Subscribed, Do hereby Solemnly Testifie and Declare, on Behalf of our selves, and the People of God called *Quakers*, with whom we have Christian Society, in the aforesaid Counties; and that In the Presence of Almighty GOD, who knows our Hearts, &c. Switch, p. 368, 369. — "Committing all to that GOD that Searches the Heart, and Tries the Reins, and Knows our Integrity herein, with full Purpose and Resolution to persevere in this our Peaceable Principle and Profession, — through the Assistance of our God, while we have a Being in these Earthly Tabernacles, *Ibid.* p. 371.

Note, It was upon the Occasion of a Terrene Affair, viz. the *Insurrection* of the *Duke of Monmouth*, that the *Friends* aforesaid, on behalf of themselves, and the People called *Quakers*, in the Counties of *Somerset, Devon, and Dorset*, used the *Solemn Forms* prementioned, as, *We Solemnly Testifie and Declare, in the Presence of Almighty GOD, who Knows our Hearts, &c.* And for what End did they use them, but to add a Sanction, and gain Credit to their Testimony?

26. *John Blaykling*, and others, in a Book, Intituled, *Antichristian Treachery discovered, and its Way block'd up, &c.* in Three Parts, being an Answer to — *William Rogers*, without Date, but said to be Printed in the Year 1686. See *John Whiting's Catalogue*, p. 15.

A Meeting being appointed to be at *Pow-bank* in *Westmoreland*, the 24th Day of the 5th Month, 1675. and it being given out by *John Scory* and *John Wilkinfon*, after they had notice of it, That they did not intend to come at any more Meetings on that occasion; *John Blaykling* sends them a Letter, wherein he hath these Words, viz. "I could see no Justifiable Plea, you could have, in the Sight of God and Friends, to Absent your selves. *Antichristian Treachery*, &c. Part II. p. 43.

Their Absence from the Meeting was a Terrene Affair, and yet *J. Blaykling* uses a Solemn Affirmation in the Sight of God concerning it.

W. Rogers having told two Friends, that he had sent *G. Fox* a Copy of his Paper three Weeks before, and afterwards denied he had said so, *John Pearson*, *John Blaykling*, *Joseph Bains* and *Robert Barrow*, charge him with an Abominable Lye, — and say, If this be not Dissembling Work, "The Just God and the Upright may Judge, *Ibid.* Part III. p. 119.

If the Affair, wherein the Name of God was here used, is not Terrene, tell me what is?

"I do Declare (saith *J. Blaykling*) in the Presence of the God of Heaven, before whom I stand, that on this wise was the Concern — in Relation to this Matter, on the Score whereof *William Rogers* thus wickedly appears with his Smiting Charges. *Postscript*, p. 182.

These Smiting Charges did, some of them, respect Terrene Affairs, as, Advising the Rich to secure their Worldly Estates, that so the Persecutors might not become Spoilers thereof, *Antichristian Treachery*, p. 122. The having Twelve or Thirteen Hundred Pounds secured, &c. *Ibid.* p. 128. Advising to buy off Tithes, both of Priest and Improprator, *Ibid.* p. 137. And Shifting in the time of Persecution, *Ibid.* p. 142.

J. Blaykling being Reflected upon by *W. Rogers*, to be one that Flatter'd for his Belly, Answers, "As to the Reflection, yea, the gross and infamous Charge — that

“ that relates to me, as I have a Record in my Soul
 “ over this foul Abuse; *I do Appeal to the Testimony*
 “ of Truth, that lives in the Hearts of my Brethren,
 “ — to Speak on my Behalf, — in relation to my
 “ Plain-dealing with all, with whom I have to do.
 “ *I have Cleared my Conscience in God's Sight, in*
 “ Faithful Dealing with all, without Flattery or
 “ Fear, tho' I have suffer'd thereby; I was never
 “ accused on the Account of Flattery or Self-seeking,
 “ or Speaking any Way in favour of a Repast or
 “ Small Dinner, till I met with *William Rogers's Spirit,*
Postscript, p. 184.

“ The Lord never made *William Rogers* (nor the
 “ Spirit he is of in any) Judge over me, *I stand to*
 “ God, whose Peace I have, which comforts my Soul
 “ over all, *Ibid. p. 185.*

Flattering for the Belly is, without doubt, a Terrene
 Affair.

W. Rogers having falsely charged, “ That *G. Fox* can
 “ get *J. B.* or *T. B.* to Write or Sign any thing,
 “ right or wrong, that in his Sense may tend to
 “ his Vindication, &c. *John Blaykling* Answers,
 “ Whether this be not most Unchristian and Un-
 “ civil Dealing, Let the Lord Judge, who will Repay,
Ibid. p. 188.

Are not Writing and Signing any thing, right
 or wrong, tho' never so wickedly and falsely charged
 upon Innocent Persons, *Terrene Affairs?*

27. In the Year 1690. there was a Paper which
Friends drew up in Manuscript, Intituled, *Some Reasons*
humbly Offered upon a General Account, why Solemn
Affirmations in the Presence of the Lord should be
Established by Law, to be as Valid and Effectual in all
Courts, in all manner of Process, as Swearing, with Se-
vere and Retaliated Punishments on all who Affirm Falsely.
 Which Paper contains Eight Reasons, Two
 whereof are thus expressed.

“ Fourthly, Because the Truth many times cannot
 “ be made out (*viz. by Swearing*) be the Necessity
 “ never

“ never so great, for that a great many Thousands
 “ in England scruple Swearing in any Case, and yet
 “ would Solemnly Affirm in the Presence of the Lord;
 “ the Truth, under the Law of Retaliation, in case
 “ they be found faulty.

“ Eighthly, Because the Government hath Equal
 “ Security upon them, who shall so Solemnly Affirm
 “ in the Presence of God, as upon them that Swear;
 “ for as for those that own not a God (if any such
 “ there be) the Government can have no Security
 “ upon them, but the Fear of Corporal or Pecuniary Punishments; but all that do own there is
 “ a God, will Equally be afraid of his Judgments,
 “ as they are in hopes of his Help and Mercy: For
 “ the same Condemnation is denounced from God
 “ upon Lyars, as against all other the most hainous
 “ Crimes, Rev. 21. 8. And the Government will
 “ have the same Equal Power over them in Corporal and Pecuniary Punishments.

28. I shall here transcribe an *Half Sheet*, Printed without Date, (but in our Name as a People) and probably about the Year 1690. Intituled, *The Suffering Case of the People commonly called Quakers, relating to Oaths and Swearing, Humbly Offered*; and is as followeth,

“ It is not unknown to this Nation, that ever
 “ since we were a People, it hath been our Principle,
 “ Not to Swear, Make or Take Oaths, which He who
 “ is the Starcher of all Hearts knows, is no other than
 “ a Case of pure Conscience, in tender Obedience
 “ to the Mind of Our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus
 “ Christ, as we are fully Perswaded, according as
 “ many Eminent Martyrs, and Men of Wisdom and
 “ Renown were, who Testified against Oaths and
 “ Swearing in the Gospel-Day; and not any Obstina-
 “ cy, Disaffection, or Worldly Interest whatsoever,
 “ on our Parts: We being really willing and desirous to Answer the Just and Good Ends of Law
 “ and Government, as a Peaceable People Fearing
 “ God;

" God; and for this Cause of Not Swearing we have
 " been Exposed to great Sufferings and Inconve-
 " niencies in our Persons and Estates, by tedious
 " Imprisonments, and Disabled from Receiving Our
 " Due Debts, or Defending Our Just Titles and Pro-
 " perties; not Suffered to give Evidence in Courts
 " of Judicature at Common or Civil Law, nor to An-
 " swer in Chancery or Exchequer, Prove Wills and
 " Testaments; or take Administrations, or to proceed
 " in our Trades at Custom-House; or be admitted
 " to our Lands, or trusted in our Duties and Ser-
 " vices in Courts-Let and Courts Baron, but great
 " Advantage is taken against us, because we so Fear
 " an Oath, as that we Dare not Swear: For which
 " Cause also our Children and Young Men are not Al-
 " lowed their Freedoms in Cities or Corporations,
 " when they have Faithfully Served their Appren-
 " tiships: Nor Admitted to give our Voices in
 " Elections of Magistrates and Parliament-Members
 " in divers Places, tho' Known to have Right there-
 " unto, as Free-holders, &c.

" WHEREFORE our Request is, That in all Cases
 " where Oaths are Imposed, and Swearing Required,
 " Our Word, that is, Our Solemn Affirmation or Denial,
 " as in the Fear and Presence of GOD, may be accepted
 " instead of an Oath; for which we Humbly Offer,
 " and Freely Submit, that if any under the same
 " Profession among us, Break their Word, or be
 " found False in such their Affirmation or Denial,
 " or Guilty of Falshood in any Unsworn Testimony,
 " Evidence, or Answers, That then such Penalty
 " be inflicted on the Person so Offending, as Law
 " and Justice require in Case of False Swearing or
 " Perjury.

Here we have not only the Sense of Friends, as a
 People, concerning the Lawfulness of a Solemn Affir-
 mation, or Denial, as in the Fear and Presence of God in
 Terrene Affairs, but also their Request to the Government,
 that it might be accepted instead of an Oath.

Note,

Note, *John Whiting* mentions the aforesaid *Half Sheet*, under the Title of *Sufferings*, in his *Catalogue*, &c. p. 183.

29. In the Year 1699. a Book was Printed, Intituled, *The Defence of the People called Quakers*, being a Reply to a Book lately Published by certain Priests of the County of Norfolk, under the Pretended Title of *The Quakers Challenge*, &c. The Preface is Signed by

Richard Ashby, John Fiddeman,
Thomas Banquet, Daniel Phillips,
John Hubbard, Thomas Buckingham.

Speaking of the Priests Charge, which they offer'd to Pay for, if they might have had it in Writing, and once had a Promise thereof from Dr. *Beckham*, but were afterwards denied it by Rector *Matison*, They say, "Now, being thus Imposed upon, and denied
 " *Just Measures*, we told the Auditory [*viz.* at the Conference with the Priests the 8th of the 10th Month, 1698. in *West-Dersham Steeple-House*, where, among other Friends, were *John Field* and *Samuel Waldensfield*]
 " that seeing these Persons had refused us Justice,
 " We Appealed to the Lord of Heaven and Earth, the
 " Judge of All. Defence, &c. p. 17.

Note, This Solemn Appeal to the Lord, &c. was in a Terrene Affair, viz. The Priests refusing to do them Justice, and to give them their Charge in Writing, which they offer'd to pay for.

Richard Ashby, John Hubbard, Philip Tassell, Richard Marler, Stephen Stanton, Daniel Phillips, Matth. Harrison, John Hunter, Thomas Buckingham, Richard Case and John Brown, in a Letter to the Norfolk Priests, write thus, "If you think you have Matter to charge
 " us withal, let us have your Charge under your
 " Hands, and appoint Time and Place convenient,
 " and We, or some Others of us, God willing, will meet
 " you as Publickly as you please. Defence, &c. p. 25.

Again, "Through the Lord's Assistance you shall hear
 " from us, or some others of us, whom you, or some of
 " you, have endeavour'd to Traduce, *Ibid.* p. 26.

30. John Feild, in his Book, Intituled, *Light and Truth, Discovering and Detecting Sophistry and Deceit; or, a Reply to a Book, called, A Plain Discovery of many Gross Falshoods, &c. by G. Keith. Printed 1701.* faith, speaking of G. K. "How strong he blows for Persecution; and what Clamour he makes to Incense the Government and People against us? — "Is it Reasonable that such restless Persons, that for their Passionate and Turbulent Behaviour, are Cast out from amongst the Quakers, should call to the Civil Magistrates for Coertion upon them, and Suggest such things against them? Surely Nay; neither will it, I am perswaded, be so esteemed by those in Authority, whose Wisdom and Moderation have been and are extended to the Quakers, and other Dissenters, for which they are Humbly Thankful unto God, and the Power Ordained of him, Ibid. p. 19. — "And that all, who receive Benefit by the Toleration, may Answer the good Ends proposed, Ibid. p. 20. ()

Mark, The Quakers are Humbly Thankful unto God, and the Power Ordained by him; but for what? why, the Benefit they receive by the Toleration. Where the Words, By the Toleration, must be understood, the Act, Intituled, *An Act for Exempting their Majesties Protestant Subjects, Dissenting from the Church of England, from the Penalties of Certain Laws: Which includes not only the Profession of Christian Belief, but also the Two Declarations, the One against Popery, &c. and the Other of Fidelity: For he speaks of the Toleration, without any Exception; and therefore it is to be taken in its full Extent and Latitude, with respect to the Quakers, including the said Declarations, wherein they are Solemnly and Sincerely in the Presence of God to Profess, Testifie and Declare, as the First of them requires; and Sincerely to Promise and Solemnly to Declare before God, as tis mention'd in the Second.*

Again, "I Humbly Thank God, that notwithstanding

ing G. K. faith; that I was of a Mean Outward Con-
 dition, and am now come up to be no Mean Person
 among the Quakers, &c. I never received the Cha-
 rity of others towards me, and my Family's
 Maintenance. Yet I speak not this Boastingly,
 neither do I Despise any, nor have any Intent to
 Despise any for their Poverty, knowing, the Lord
 many times makes them that are Rich, Poor, and
 the Poor, Rich; and therefore desire not to trust in
 Uncertain Riches, but in the Living God, Ibid.

P. 44. Doth not F. F. Reverently Use the Name of God
 in a Solemn Affirmation in a Temporal Affair? Nay, to
 allude to his own Mode of Speaking at some other
 Times, doth he not Bind his Speech, and Add a San-
 ction to it, even in Temporal Matters, with a Di-
 vine Attestation, as God, The Lord, The Living God?
 Which last Expression is Synonymous with, The
 Lord liveth, which the Essayer, according to his Com-
 mon Way of Saying things without Proof, (a Fault that
 runs throughout the whole Essay) asserts to be that
 Oath, which is expressly Commanded by the Lord himself
 to be used under the Legal Dispensation, Essay, p. 88.
 But this Precarious Assertion being fully refuted,
 in Sect. VII. of this Answer, I shall only repeat thus
 much of what is there argued, viz. 'Tis acknow-
 ledg'd, the Jews were commanded to Swear, The
 Lord liveth, &c. Jer. 4. 2. and 12. 16. But then
 observe, It was Swearing, and not Saying only those
 Words, that made them an Oath. For they were
 no Oath, without the Word Swear express'd, or some
 Words annexed that necessarily implied an Oath,

P. 64. Richard Rivers, in The Vicar of Banbury Cor-
 rected; Or, An Answer to Benj. Loveling's Reply to
 a Letter of Richard Rivers, in the Year 1703. saith,
 "As the Government, by the Lord's Merciful Provi-
 dence, is favourably pleased to afford us the Ex-
 ercise of our Tender Consciences, in our Peace-
 able

"able and Religious Assemblies, for which we are
 "Humbly Thankful unto God, and it, and are Resolved,
 "by the Grace of God, to continue the Queen's Peace-
 "able Subjects. Pref. p. 2, 3.

And speaking of the *Act of Toleration*, the Queen's
 Declared Resolution to stand by it, and the Liberty
 her Dissenting Subjects enjoy'd in the late Reigns,
 and do still, through the Lord's Good Providence, and
 the present Government's Favour; he adds, "For
 "which we are Humbly Thankful unto God and the Queen.
 "And it is the Resolution of me and my Friends,
 "through the Grace of God, to live Peaceably under
 "the Queen. Book, p. 3.

So in *The Vicar of Banbury Further Corrected, &c.*
 1703, R. K. Answering the Vicar's Pretended Reason
 for our being *Bad Subjects*, because we take Free-
 dom to Meet at the City of London, pleads the *Tol-*
eration for it, saying, "For which we have *Tol-*
eration from the Government, and are Humbly
 "Thankful, and Bless God for that Mercy, and Prize
 "the Providence that affords it, p. 20.

And in *Further Correction of the Vicar of Banbu-*
ry, &c. in the Year 1704, he saith, "He [the Vicar]
 "can't endure *Toleration*, and had he the Power
 "here, that the French King hath in his Country,
 "and the People were of his Mind, we have Cause
 "to conclude, we should have the like Usage the
 "French Protestants have there. But this is our Com-
 "fort, *Cursed Cows have short Horns*; and tho' he is
 "Envious and Cruel, yet our Governours are more
 "Christian, Wise and Moderate; and We are Humbly
 "Thankful unto God, and to Them for the Liberty we
 "enjoy; and are Resolved, by the Lord's Assistance,
 "to walk worthy of the Mercy and Favour we re-
 "ceive from God and Them, p. 13.

In the foregoing Quotations are several *Sacram-*
Affirmations, wherein the Name of God is used in a
 Civil or Terrene Affair, viz. The *Toleration* Establiſh'd
 by Law; which, tho' it allows Liberty for Religious

Worship, yet it requires of those *Dissenters* from the Church of England, who Scruple the Taking of any Oath, [*viz. the Quakers*] that every such Person shall Make and Subscribe the Declaration mentioned in a Statute made in the Thirtieth Year of the Reign of King Charles the Second, Intituled, *An Act to Prevent Papists from Sitting in either House of Parliament*, which begins thus, "I A. B. do Solemnly and Sincerely, in the Presence of God, Profess, Testifie and Declare, &c. And a little after, "I do Solemnly, in the Presence of God, Profess, Testifie and Declare, &c.

And also this Declaration of Fidelity, which begins thus, "I A. B. do Sincerely Promise, and Solemnly Declare, before God and the World, &c. Which Declarations and Subscriptions are Civil or Terrene Actions, and may be perform'd by Persons of Wicked, as well as Good Lives and Conversations. Now he that Professeth, as *Richard Vivers* doth for himself and his Friends, (especially those that Approved of his Book, among which *John Feild* was one) to be Humbly Thankful unto God and the Queen for the Toleration; and to be Resolved, through the Grace of God, or by the Lord's Assistance, to Live Peaceably under the Queen, and to Walk Worthy of the Mercy and the Favour they receive from God and the Government; without making any Exception to the Two Declarations aforesaid, wherein the Presence of God is so particularly required to be mentioned, cannot be otherwise understood, than to Approve of the said Declarations, according to the true Intent and Meaning of the Act of Toleration, without any Evasion, Equivocation or Mental Reservation whatsoever.

Again, The Vicar having Untruly Charged the Quakers with being the worst Subjects in the World, and Uncharitably Censured them, as not to be Tolerated, or Suffer'd to Propagate their Kind; R. Vivers, to take off this most Wicked Charge, and Unmerciful Sentence, makes this Solemn Appeal, saying, "To the Just Witness of God, or Light of Christ in all your Con-
"sciences,

" sciences, I Appeal. *Vicar of Banbury further Corrected, in Preface to the Inhabitants thereof, &c.* p. 2.

That this was spoken in a *Terrene Affair*, is so evident, that nothing can be plainer.

32. *John Whiting*, in his Book, Intituled, *Judas and the Chief Priests Conspiring to Betray Christ and his Followers; or, An Apostate Convicted, and Truth Defended, in Answer to George Keith's Fourth Narrative, &c.* Printed in the Year 1701. Speaking of the *Evil Treatment* we have met with from several *Apostates*, saith, "But to the Lord, the Righteous Judge of Heaven and Earth we Commit our Cause; who will, we doubt not, in due Time, Arise and Ease himself of His and Our Adversaries, and Avenge himself of all His and Zion's Enemies. Preface, p. 3.

"For the rest, who are Prepossess'd, and will easily be deceived, and carried away with Noise and Clamour, however False, or whatever the Event will be, I have little to say to such, or hopes of Justice from them, but Leave them to the Lord, (to whom we Appeal, and Commit our Cause) and the Judgment of the Great Day, Ibid. p. 5.

"What is here done, is more for the Sake of others, than G. K.'s, that none may be any more deceived by him, whom I count Obdurate, and past Cure, without a Miracle, his Enmity and Perversions being so great and wilful: But to the Lord I Leave him, to Deal with him, Ibid. p. 6.

Are not *Evil Treatment*, *Noise* and *Clamour*, *Enmity* and *Perversions*, *Temporal* or *Terrene Matters*? And yet speaking of these Things, and of *Apostates*, *Prepossess'd Persons*, and G. K. as *Obdurate* and *Past Cure*; J. W. Commits our Cause to the Lord, the Righteous Judge of Heaven and Earth; Leaves Prepossess'd Persons to the Lord, Appeals to him for Judgment, and Leaves G. K. to the Lord to Deal with him.

G. Keith having said, "That the Act of Toleration has no more Declared their [viz. the Quakers] Principles to be Christian, than the Toleration that Hol-
" land,

" land, &c. hath given the Jews and Papists, doth
 " Declare their Principles to be Christian. J. Whiting
 Replies, " That this is a most Impudent, as well as
 " Malicious Falshood, the Act it self shews, where
 " they [viz. the Quakers] are not only Intitled to
 " it, with other Protestant Dissenters, by Subscribing
 " the Declaration against Popery; but in particular,
 " Recognized on Subscribing a Declaration of Fide-
 " lity, instead of the Oath, and a Profession of their
 " Christian Belief, in these Words; I A. B. Profess
 " Faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his Etern-
 " nal Son, the True God, and in the Holy Spirit, One
 " God Blessed for evermore: And do acknowledge the
 " Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be
 " given by Divine Inspiration. Which Declarations
 " and Subscriptions shall be Made and Entred at the
 " General Quarter-Sessions of the Peace. --- And every
 " such Person as shall Make and Subscribe the Two
 " Declarations and Profession aforesaid, being there-
 " unto Required, shall be Exempted from all Pains
 " and Penalties of all and every the foresaid Sta-
 " tutes, — and Enjoy all other the Benefits, Privi-
 " leges and Advantages, under the like Limitations,
 " Proviso's and Conditions, which any other Dissenters
 " shall or ought to Enjoy, by Virtue of this Act.
 Postscript, p. 199, 200.

" And this, saith J. Whiting, *Wile Peter Refused,*
 " when Called thereto, Ibid. p. 200.

This, what? Answer, *The Declaration against Po-
 pery, Declaration of Fidelity, and Profession of our
 Christian Belief.* For This having no other Ante-
 cedent, but the Declarations and Profession afore-
 said, must necessarily be understood of them. The
 Truth of which farther appears, by his Summing
 up all in these Words, *Which Declarations, &c.* And
 then adding, to tell his plain Meaning, *And this*
Wile Peter Refused, when Called thereto; that is, *We*
the People called Quakers, being thereunto Re-
 quired by the Magistrate. For J. W. brings the
 Act

Act of Toleration, and the *Declarations and Profession* therein mentioned, to prove, that the *Quakers* are there Recognized to be *Christians*, and that their Principles are *Christian*, and they intitled to the Peaceable Profession of them, in Common with other *Protestant Dissenters*.

If *J. W.* intended the foregoing Paragraph with Restriction to the *Satisfied Friends*, then he hath granted *G. K.*'s Argument with respect to the *Dissatisfied*, and consequently excluded both them and their Principles the *Pale of Christianity*; that is to say, so far as the *Act* Recognizeth the People called *Quakers*, and their Principles, to be *Christian*. And then what will become of *J. W.*'s following Interrogatories? *Are they no more declared to be Christian, than the Jews and Papists in Holland, &c.* What will *this Incendiary Stick* say? Will nothing satisfy him, but he must call in Question the *Act of Parliament*, as well as the *Quakers Books*? Would this be born in others? But the Business is, it's like *G. K.* don't own that Profession to be *Christian*. "Well," as I have said, *We Leave him to the Lord to Deal with him*, p. 200.

Now, what *Solemn Affirmations* in the Presence of God, and Before God, are required in the *Two Declarations* aforesaid, see before in p. 132. And which *Declarations and Subscription* [viz. to *A Profession of our Christian Belief*] *Will Peter Refuse*, saith *J. W.* when Called thereon.

This he Declared to be His Judgment, and the Judgment of Friends, as a People, in the Year 1701.

And in Answer to *George Keith's Journal*, in his Book, Intituled, *Truth the Strongest of all*, &c. in Reply to *G. K.*'s Fifth Narrative, Printed in the Year 1712. p. 160. to shew that He and Friends were not Altered in their Judgments, he quotes in the Margin, *Judas*, &c. p. 199. where he expressly mentions the *Two Declarations* aforesaid; and *Profession of our Christian Belief*; tho' here he mentions the Latter only,

only, saying, *Which we are Still ready to Own and Subscribe*; but doth not say, *We Disown or Refuse the Former*; which it had been necessary for him to have done, in those or such like Words, if *His* and *Friends* Judgments had been Alter'd. But admit that his own Judgment is Alter'd, as to the *Declarations* aforesaid; yet seeing he is *Still ready to Own and Subscribe a Profession of Christian Belief*, and that *Profession* is the same for Substance with the *Solemn Affirmations* in the *Presence of God*, expressed in the *Two* said *Declarations*, and used for the same End and Purpose, that they are, *namely*, To Exempt the *Quakers* from the *Penalties of Certain Laws*, which are *Terrene Affairs*, the Matter still Centers where it did, and will rest there; unless it can be proved, that the *Name of God* is not used in the *Profession of Christian Belief*, as well as in the *Two* said *Declarations*, one against *Popery*, and the other of *Fidelity*, as a *Qualification* for that Exemption; which is impossible; because the *Act of Toleration* makes them equally necessary thereunto.

Edward Cockson, Rector of Westcot-Barton in the County of Oxon, having charged John Whiting with *Denying the Lord that Bought us*: J. W. sent him a Letter, dated, London, the 6th of the 11th Month, 1707. wherein, after Denial of the Charge (as well he might, for I am perswaded, that neither such a Thought ever enter'd into his Heart, nor any such Expression drop'd from his Tongue or Pen,) he writeth thus, "Herein thou hast done me much *Wrong*, and if thou dost not give me *Satisfaction*, "so as to *Clear* me as Publickly as thou hast *Aspers'd* "me, I will (God willing) *Expose* thee to the Nation, "in this and other *Passages*,"—Rector Corrected, &c. p. 3. Printed 1708.

Note, J. W. not only Menaces Priest Cockson, with Exposing of him to the Nation, but *Binds* that Menace with the *Sacred Name of God*, and that in a *Terrene* Affair.

J. Whiting

J. Whiting having charged *G. Keith* with Twelve Lyes in less than Eleven Lines, Answ. to *G. K.*'s Journal, in *Truth the Strongest of all*, &c. p. 157. Printed 1712. with going about to foment Differences, and beget Strife and Contention among Protestants one against another, and that it was nothing but Envy and Self-Interest set him on Work, Ibid. p. 160. And with Falshood or Partiality in his Quotations out of *G. Fox's Gr. Myst.* --- *R. Claridge's Lux Evang.* Attest. --- *W. Penn's Primitive Christianity*, and --- *E. Burrough's*, Ibid. p. 165, 161. He [*viz.* *J. W.*] saith, "On the whole, he [*viz.* *G. K.*] is so False in some things, that his Credit is questionable in the rest. And then adds, "So To God the Righteous Judge, who shall bring every Work to Judgment, with every Secret Thing, whether it be Good, or whether it be Evil, I Leave him, for all his Abuses and Wrong he hath done us, and To the Judgment of the Great Day --- To Judge between us, Ibid. p. 161.

Here the Name of God is Solemnly Attested, and Appealed to in Terrene Affairs; and *G. K.* for the Abuses and Wrong he hath done us, left under a most Tremendous Sentence.

Many more Testimonies of Friends (for we are in this Cause encompassed with a Cloud of Witnesses) might be produced, to prove the Lawfulness of the Reverent Using the Name of God in a Solemn Affirmation in Terrene Affairs, and to Demonstrate to all the Moderate and Impartial among us; that we, who are Satisfied with the Present Form, do Walk in the Good Old Way, and keep to the Land-mark or Boundary of our Ancients; even the Yea, and Nay, Commanded by our Blessed Saviour, and Practised by Him and his Holy Apostles: But intending not to Cloy, but to Satisfie the Reader, I have thought the Foregoing Testimonies, presented as in a Map, sufficient to give him a Clear View of that Noble Branch of Truth, so Unhappily Misrepresented by the *Essayer*, under

Pretence to Fresh or Further Discoveries of the Gospel-Testimony, Essay, p. 94.

But here it may be Objected by some, that the *Essayer* saith, "The Question, if rightly Stated, is
"not what *Peter, George, Francis, Robert* or *William*;
"or such a Body, Society, or Meeting said or did;
"offer'd or agreed to; but what their and our
"Lord hath Commanded, Prohibited, and Instituted," *Essay*, p. 91.

Ans. 1. If *Peter, George, Francis, &c.* have said or done, offer'd or agreed to, what their and our Lord hath Commanded, Prohibited and Instituted; then the Question, by the *Essayer's* own Argument, is rightly Stated: But *Peter, George, Francis, &c.* have said or done, offer'd or agreed to, what their and our Lord hath Commanded, Prohibited and Instituted; Therefore, &c.

The Sequel of the *Major* is Undeniable, and the *Minor* is fully Proved in the preceding Part of this *Answer*, whereunto the *Reader* is referred.

2. A Question may be rightly Stated *two Ways*, either according to the Nature of the Thing, as it is in it self; or, as it hath Relation to some present Controversie emerging from it. The Question between the *Satisfied* and *Dissatisfied* may be consider'd *both Ways*; if the Former, then it must be decided by *Scripture*, and *Sound Reasons* deduced therefrom; but if the Latter, then the *Testimonies of Friends* are very Considerable: And for that End it is, that the foregoing *Testimonies* are produced. For *One Part* of the *Controversie* being about the Sense and Judgment of our *Friends*, concerning *Solemn Affirming*, with some *Attestation of God*, in *Civil or Terrene Affairs*, from the *Time of First Publishing again God's Blessed and Everlasting Truth* in the last Century, after a Long and Dismal Night of Darkness and Apostacy, that had overspread the Minds of the People, till some *Scruples* were of late Years first Raised, then Disseminated, and now Increased to, and

and Maintained as a Principle; and the *Contenders* Pleading the *Testimonies of Friends* in Favour of their Different Apprehensions; The only Way left for putting this Matter to a Fair Issue, is, by having Recourse to their *Testimonies*, and Hearing them Speak in *their own Words*, Simply and Plainly, what their Sense was, rather than in *Ours*: And then let the Honest and Indifferent Reader Judge, whether their *Testimonies* make for the *Solemn Affirmation* or not. For I would not have *him* led, by a Blind and Implicit Credulity, or suffer his Understanding to be govern'd by such Mean Things, as *Prejudice, Self-Interest, Party*, or the *Single Opinion* of some Designing *Innovators*, but to See with his own Eyes, Hear with his own Ears, and Judge according to the Plain Evidence of Things, as they nakedly appear before him, abstracted from the Disguised Dresses put upon them by Subtil Men; whose Glosses, how Specious soever they seem, are, when truly and thoroughly Examined, real Perversions or Misrepresentations of our *Friends Testimonies*.

3. If the Question, if rightly Stated, is not what *Peter, George, Francis, Robert, or William*, or such a Body, Society or Meeting, said or did; offer'd or agreed to, &c. as the *Essayer* saith; why then doth he himself quote so many Authorities or Testimonies, in Favour, as he thinks, of his Judgment? see *Essay*, p. 22. Nay, If the Question is not what *Peter, or James, or John, &c.* said or did, as he says, *Robert Barclay* well observes, *Ibid.* p. 91. Wherefore doth he Triumph in "The Testimony of the Holy Apostles; The Plain and Simple Practice of the Primitive Christians; The Lively Examples of the Suffering Martyrs; the Judgment of so many Ancient Fathers, Vertuous Heathens, Learned Doctors, Famous Protestants, and Religious Persons, for our President in this Matter; and all [*as he Erroneously says*] "Corroborated by the Concurrent Testimonies of our Ancient Friends and Brethren,

"in their said *Treatise of Oaths*, [*Essay*, p. 28, 73, 74] "and *Declaration* aforesaid, [*Ibid.* p. 22, 80.] "not Transiently Touch'd, but Written "to the Government Professedly on that Subject, "and Subscribed by those Two and Twenty Eminent Friends aforesaid, on Behalf of themselves, "and the rest of the People call'd *Quakers*? Adding, by way of *Epiphonema* or *Acclamation*, "Who "knowing this to be true, can be so Ungrateful to "God, his Truth, or Himself either, as to desert "such a Cause, and so much good Company? Or, "who can any longer, without offering Violence to "his Reason, understand the Doctrine of Christ, "Swear not at all, &c. otherwise than asserted according to those Authorities aforesaid? *Essay*, p. 82.

Have not others the like Liberty of quoting *Authorities* and *Testimonies*, that he himself hath? Or, Is it a *Crime* in them, and a *Virtue* in him, to quote them? Doubtless the quoting of *Authors* is a *Common Privilege*, and not His, or any One Man's *Sole Prerogative*.

But not to let the foregoing *Paragraph* pass without an Impartial Examination, to prevent the *Reader's* being imposed upon by the *Essayer's* Vain-glorious Amusements; it will be necessary to observe, that

1. He Contradicts himself about the Testimony of the Holy Apostle, by whom he understands the Apostle *James*; for in p. 91. he saith, *The Question is not what — James said or did*; but here he alledgeth the *Apostle's* Testimony, as *Authentic*.

2. He insinuates, as if the Apostle *James*, who was against all *Swearing*, was also against all *Solemn Affirming in the Name of God*, as being more than *Yea* and *Nay*; when he gives express Direction to the contrary, saying, *For that ye ought to say, If the Lord will, we shall live, and do this or that*, Jam. 4. 15.

3. He

3. He alledging the Plain and Simple Practice of the *Primitive Christians*, and Examples of the *Suffering Martyrs*, without any Exception, insinuates as tho' All the *Primitive Christians*, and All the *Suffering Martyrs*, were of his *New Opinion*; whereas there were but Some of them against *All Swearing*, and None that ever I read of, (and I Challenge him to give One Instance to the Contrary) that were against an *Affirmation* including the *Name of God*.

As for the *Primitive Christians*, Bp. Gauden (whom the *Essayist* quotes, p. 76. but in part, because he could not but know, that the Passage taken together made against him) limits their Cautionness of *Swearing* to *Private Conversation*, or *Any Oath, for Matter, or Manner, or Authority Unlawful*. His Words, as quoted by S. Fisher, in his Answer to the Bishop, p. 66. are these, "In *Private Conversation*, saith the Bishop, (*Primitive*) *Christians* were then esteemed so Strict, Exact and Cautious of their Words, in Asserting or Promising, that there was no need of an *Oath* among them; yea, they so kept up the Sanctity and Credit of their Profession among Unbelievers, that it was Security enough in all Cases to say, *Christianus sum*, I am a Christian. If they urged them further to any *Oath*, for Matter, or Manner, or Authority *Unlawful*, they repeated this as the only Satisfaction they could give; there needed no more than the Veracity of their bare Record: They thought it not Lawful for them in such Cases [that is, In *Private Conversation*] to Swear.

Now, observe the Unfairness and Insincerity of the *Essayist*, who having quoted only a Part of the Bishop's Words, and left out that which limits the whole Passage to *Private Conversation*, &c. makes this *Fallacious* Remark upon them, "It should seem by this, that when they [*viz. The Primitive Christians*] were urged to an *Oath*, they would go no farther

"farther towards one, either in *Matter* or *Manner*, (leaving out the Words, Or *Authority* Unlawful, because that would have marr'd his Cause) "than their "*Bare Words*." And then cries out, "O happy People, in this Respect at least, who so fully answered "their Master's Precept, *Essay*, p. 76. To Decoy the Reader into a Belief, that the *Primitive Christians* were in General against *Swearing* in All Cases, when the *Bishop* expressly restricts their Cautiousness of *Swearing* to *Private Conversation*, or Any Oath, for *Matter*, or *Manner*, or *Authority* Unlawful.

Reader, I find the *Essayer* either so Partial in his Quotations, or so strangely Mis-interpreting of 'em, to make them suit with his *Hypothesis*, that I know not whether *Bugg*, *Keith*, *Cockson*, or *Bennet*, have therein exceeded him: Nay, if he had read the *Bishop* but a little farther, in *S. F.* p. 67. in his Answer before mentioned, he might have met with these Words, "Hence we find, (saith the *Bishop*) "some of the Antient Fathers, as *Origen*, *Chrysostom*, *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius*, *Hilary*, *Athanasius*, *St. Jerom*, *Theodoret*, *Lactantius*, and others, frequently inveighing, without any Limitation or Reserve, as to *Christians Swearing* in *Private Conversation*: But this would have quite Spoiled his Design, and therefore he takes no notice of it in his *Essay*.

And for the *Examples of the Suffering Martyrs*, the *Essayer* hath produced none, neither hath the Declaration of the People called *Quakers* aforesaid any Instances of *Martyrs*, but *Polycarpus* and *Basilides*. And because *Fox's Acts*, and *Monuments* are cited for the proving thereof, and the Fact misunderstood, I shall therefore, to set it right, give an Account of the Matter, just as *Fox* relates it. The *Proconsul* said unto him, "Be Good unto thy self, and Favour thine "Old Age, — Swear by the *Emperor's Good Fortune*, "— Take thine Oath, and I will Discharge thee, "Defy Christ. *Polycarpus* answered, Fourscore and "Six

" Six Years have I been his Servant, yet in all his
 " Time hath he not so much as Hurt me. How
 " then may I speak Evil of my King and Sovereign
 " Lord, which hath thus preserved me? Then the
 " *Proconsul* again inforced him, and said, *Swear*
 " thou, I advise thee, by *Caesar's Prosperity*. *Poly-*
 " *carpus* replieth, If thou require of me this fond
 " Word of Vain Boasting, feigning not to know
 " (as thou sayest) who I am, I do thee to wit, that
 " *I am a Christian*; and if thou desire to know the
 " Doctrine of Christianity, appoint a Day, and thou
 " shalt hear. *Acts and Mon.* p. 47. Vol. 1. Edit. 9.
 Printed 1684.

The *Swearing* that the *Proconsul* press'd, and *Poly-*
carpus deny'd, was the *Defying* (or *Renouncing*) of
Christ with an *Oath*, by the *Emperor's Good Fortune*,
 or *Caesar's Prosperity*. And that he might the more
 easily induce *Polycarpus* to do it, the *Proconsul* feign-
 ed, not to know him to be a *Christian*; to clear up
 which, *Polycarpus* not only lets him know, that he
 was a *Christian*, but one ready to Teach the *Doctrine*
of Christianity; and yet not against *All Swearing*, as
 it is misunderstood.

The Case of *Basilides* will appear as plain as this,
 by the Transcription of *Fox's* Words, which are
 these; "*Basilides*, saith he, was required to give
 " an *Oath*, in a Matter concerning his Fellow-
 " Soldiers, which thing he denied to do, plainly
 " Affirming, *He was a Christian*; For their *Oath* then
 " was wont to be by the *Idols*, and the *Emperor*.
Acts and Mon. p. 60. *Ibid.*

From hence we see, what *Swearing* it was that
 this *Martyr* refused, viz. By *Idols*, &c.

I am grieved to meet with what I do in some
 Prints, viz. Quotations so often Mistaken, to the
 no small Prejudice of Truth, among those who are
Learned Adversaries of it..

4. When the *Essayer* Boasts of " The Judgment
 " of so many *Ancient Fathers*, *Vertuam Heathens*,
 " *Learned*

“*Learned Doctors, Famous Protestants, and Religious Persons*, for our President in this Matter; and all “*Corroborated (as he says) by the Concurent Testimonies of our Ancient Friends and Brethren*, in “*their said Treatise of Oaths, and Declaration afore-* “*said, &c.* Who, that either wanteth Leisure or Ability to Examine them, would not be ready to conclude, that they are All to a Man on the *Essayer's* Side? and not only Witnesses against *All Swearing*, but also against *All Affirming in the Name of God*, as is hinted before? But upon Examination, I do assure the Reader, I find it to be otherwise, and offer these following Instances for his Satisfaction.

1. For the many *Ancient Fathers* the *Essayer* speaks of, it is to be noted, that he quotes but Five, *Athanasius, Casarius, Chrysostom, Euthymius Zigabenus*, and *Druthmarus* in the Title-Page, and they, every one of them, do make against him.

For *Athanasius*, to Purge himself of a Calumny, took an Oath before the Emperor *Constantius*, as *Grotius* says in his *Annotations upon Mat. 5. 34.* in *Synops. Critic.* See *Athanasius's Apol. to Constantius*, Tom. 1. p. 528.

Casarius, Brother to *Gregory Nazianzen*, is cited, *Essay*, p. 43. from *Treatise of Oaths*, p. 67. but very imperfectly; for the whole Quotation is this, “*Flee* “*All Swearing, or Every Oath: How then shall we* “*get Belief? As well by Speech, as by Virtuous* “*Actions and Carriages, that gain Belief to our* “*Speech. Perjury is a Denying of God: What* “*need of God in this Matter? Interpose and put* “*in Ure thy Actions.*

Where, observe, There is not one Word against *Affirming in the Name of God*; and the Caution against *All Swearing* is restricted by the Word *Perjury*. And the plain Sense of the Paragraph is this, Rather than incur the Guilt of *Perjury*, which is a *Denying of God*, Flee *All Swearing*.

Chrysostom,

Chrysostom, quoted as *Condemning All Swearing*, *Essay*, p. 33. in his *Fifth Homily ad Pop. Antioch. Treat. of Oaths*, p. 72. doth allow of an Oath in some Cases. His Words are these, "Moreover, this I say, That in the mean time we may cut off All Superfluous Oaths, those, I mean, which are made Rashly, and without any Necessity, amongst Friends and Servants. And if thou take away These, in the Other thou shalt need me no more. For that Mouth which hath learned to Fear and Flee an Oath, if any would compel it Ten Thousand times, it will never admit of falling into that Custom.

Here we see what Oaths *Chrysostom* would have Cut off, namely, All Superfluous, or Rash and Unnecessary Oaths. And by the Words, Friends, Servants, and Custom, what can be understood, but a Prohibition of Swearing Customary Oaths in Private Conversation?

Euthymius Zigabenus (whom the *Effayer* falsely Spells *Euthimiuss Zagabonuss*, as is noted before, p. 41.) disallowed not of All Swearing, as appears by his Words cited in the *Treatise of Oaths*, p. 116. saying, "Thou that Swearest, so be thou dost not Forswear, thou observeest the Worship of God.

Druthmarus, whom the *Effayer*, as I observed already, p. 57. places in the Front of his Book, had he not been Partially quoted, would not have Served his Turn. For *Druthmarus* on *Mat. 3.* saith thus, "Lest the Jews should Swear by Idol's Names, the Lord suffered them to Swear by his own Name; neither hath he forbidden it unto us: But taught Perfection, that such Trust should be among Christians, that there should be no need to Interpose the Name of God for Witness. Both they and we are prohibited Perjury. See *Vossij Hist. Pelag.* 1. 3. pars 2. *Antishe* sis 1. p. 724. Edit. *Amstelodami*, 1701.

This is the Quotation intire, as I met with it in *Vossius*; but the Partial *Effayer*, to make it Speak in

his Favour, hath left out all those Words in the Italian Character, because so directly contrary to his Design.

2. *Vertuous Heathens*; Of which he mentions not one, but refers in the Margin to the *Treatise of Oaths*, where

1. *Pythagoras* is brought for a Witness against Swearing, tho' in *Courts of Judicature*, Ibid. p. 30, 31. but in those *Golden Verses*, that go under his Name, and contain a Summary of the *Pythagorick Doctrine*, he expressly Commands,

Σέβου ὅρκον, v. 2. *Revere thy Oath*, and delivers a Form for it,

Ναὶ μὰ τὸν ἀμείλιτον Ἰούδα μακάριστα τέλειον.

Παύλῳ ἀνὰς Φύσεως. v. 47, 48. that is, *I Swear by him that gives to our Soul the Tetractys, or Quaternary Number, which is the Spring of Eternal Nature.*

Likewise we are told by *Hesychius*, Τέλειος Πυθαγορείος ὅρκος that the *Tetractys*, or *Quaternary Number*, was the *Oath* of the *Pythagoreans*. See *Gale's Court of the Gentiles*, Part 2. Book 2. c. 8. p. 183.

2. *Hierocles* is alledged to testify, "That *Pythagoras*, in enjoining them to *Revere an Oath*, not "only *Prohibits Forswearing*, but requires them also "to *Abstain from Swearing*, *Comment. in Carm. Pythag. in Treat. of Oaths*, p. 31. But that Place should have been translated thus, "That Precept,

"*Revere thy Oath*, doth not only Com-
* Εὐοχεῖν "mand us to **Swear Well*, or *Religious-*

ly, but also to *Abstain from an Oath*. And the following Words, which are omitted in the said *Treatise*, fully explain the Meaning, "We "shall observe, saith he, always to *Swear Well* or "Religiously, if we never abuse *Oaths*; for by the "Custom, or frequent Habit of *Swearing*, a Man may "easily fall into *Perjury*. So that indeed *Absti-*
"nence from *Swearing*, may be said to be an Ob-
"serva-
"

“ Preservation of it. For by this means, either there
 “ will be no *Swearing* at all; or when a Man *Swears*,
 “ he will *Swear Well* or *Religiously*; the Tongue, by
 “ *Customary Swearing*, neither running before the
 “ Understanding, nor the Understanding being
 “ perverted by the Insolency of the Passions; for
 “ the one a good Man will take care to rectifie,
 “ and the other is prevented by Refraining the
 “ *Frequency of Swearing*. Now this *Swearing Well*
 “ or *Religiously*, is Essential to that Honour and
 “ Worship of God, whereof I spoke before. For
 “ it is, as it were, the Twin and Handmaid of
 “ Piety; and indeed, an Oath was assign’d as a Guar-
 “ dian of the Divine Law, for the Beauty and
 “ Ornament of the whole. Reverence therefore
 “ the Law, by observing what it directs, and Re-
 “ verence an Oath, by not rashly or hastily abusing
 “ it; that so thou may’st accustom thy self to *Swear*
 “ *Well* or *Religiously*, by keeping from *Frequent* or
 “ *Ordinary Swearing*: For *Swearing Well* or *Religiously*,
 “ is no Small Part of Piety.

Again, “ In such things, (saith *Hierocles*) as are
 “ real and necessarily joined, and of very great
 “ Moment, it is both Safe and Commendable to
 “ *Swear*. *Comment. in Carm. Pythag. v. 47.*

So that *Hierocles* did not understand *Pythagoras*
 to be against *All Swearing*, but against *All Rash*,
Hasty, *Frequent*, and *Customary Swearing*; for
 he Commends [*Euxenia*] *Swearing Well* or *Religi-
 ously*.

3. “ *Isocrates*, a Greek Orator, in his Oration to
 “ *Demonicus*, advises, (saith the *Treatise of Oaths*,
 p. 32.) “ Not to take an Oath for Money Matters. Al-
 “ so he teaches, That Good Men should shew themselves
 “ more Credible than an Oath. But that is but a Part
 of what he there says: For in the
 same Place he advises, to Take an *ὅρκον ἐπὶ καλῶν*
 Oath, if it be required, for these two *ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν*, &c.
 Reasons; either for the Clearing of a

Man's self from some Foul Crime; or, the Delivering of our Friends from Dangers. And not far before, in the same Oration, he saith, *First Worship the Immortal Gods*, (speaking after the Manner of the Gentiles, he being a Pagan) not only by Offering Sacrifices, but also by keeping thine Oath.

4. "Epictetus, (saith the said Treatise, p. 34.) a Famous and Grave Stoick, Counsell'd, To Refuse

"an Oath Altogether: Whereas, he saith thus, Refuse an Oath altogether, if it may be; but if not, do what thou can'st. Which shews, he allow'd of an Oath in Cases of Necessity.

Ὁρκον παρὰ τῆς ἀνάγκης, εἰ μὴ οἱ δύνηται, εἰς ἅπαντα εἰδὼς μὴ, ἐν τῇ δυνάμει. Epict. Enchirid. c. 44.

5. Quintilian, a Famous Roman Orator and Rhetorician, is quoted,

Treatise of Oaths, p. 34. as saying, That "in Time

"past it was a kind of Infamy for Grave and Approved Men to Swear. But if the whole Sentence

be consider'd, we shall find, he admits of Swearing, when Necessity requires it. * 'Tis not Convenient, saith

* In totum Jurare, nisi ubi necesse est, gravi Viro parum Convenit. Quintil. Instit. Orator. l. 9. c. 2. p. 419. Edit. Londini, 1641.

he, for a Grave Man to Swear at all, except when it is necessary.

3. Learned Doctors, Famous Protestants, and Religious Persons: But

were All these of the Essayer's Judgment in the Present Controversie? Were they All

Anti-Swearers and Anti-Affirmers, as he pretends they were? Surely No. In order therefore to Detect the Essayer, I shall give his Authorities an Impartial Examination.

He begins with a Passage in Johannes Pricaus, Essay, p. 22. viz. "Qui Autem, &c. i. e. But he that shall consider the Words [At All], &c. (of which before, p. 41.) But that proves not, that he was against All Swearing, or Affirming in the Name of God. For, if we look a few Lines back, we may see what J. P.'s Not Swearing relates to, namely,

namely, to Oaths in Matters respecting Common Conversation. For, saith he, "Let your Covenants, Bargains or Contracts, and Promises, be as Firm and Strong, as if they had been Confirmed with Oaths: That is, Do not Swear in your Covenants, Bargains, Contracts and Promises.

Pactis Promissisq;
vestris, ac si Fir-
mata Juramentis
essent, idem ro-
bur esto, Joannis
Pricæi, Annotat.
in Mat. 5. 37. E-
dit. Lond. 1660.

And then for Affirming in the Name of God, in his Annotations upon James 4. 15. For that ye ought to say, If the Lord will, &c. he quotes out of Tertullian, that Frequent Saying of Socrates, || If my Demon permit; out of Minucius Felix, those Phrases, which were commonly used even by the Heathen, as, † God is Great, and, God is True, and, If God Grant; out of Lampridius, a Saying of Alex. Severus, ‡ If the Gods will; and the same out of * Julian's Epistles, with some Passages out of Seneca about Navigation and Merchandize; which latter, especially, he reckons parallel to that of James 4. And having hinted at some Examples that others have brought from the Apostle [Paul] he adds, to shew his Sense of Using the Name of God in Terrene Affairs, 1 Cor. 16. 7. Rom. 1. 10. and 15. 32. where the Apostle speaks, in the first of these Places, of his Tarrying a while with the Corinthians, If the Lord permit; and in the two last, of his Journey, and Coming to the Romans, By the Will of God.

|| Si Dæmonium
permittat.

† Deus Magnus
est, & Deus Ve-
rus est, & si Deus
dederit.

‡ Si Dii Volu-
erint.

* Εἰ Θεοὶ θέλωσιν.

Alphonsus de Avendano, quoted Essay, p. 27. saith, "The Truth of the Gospel receives no Oath, Treat. of Oaths, p. 135. But then his next Words shew his Meaning, viz. "As Good and Desirable of it self. For some things, not Good and Desirable of themselves, may be Good and Desirable by God's Positive Command; as, in the Case of Circumcision among the Jews,

Jews, which of it self had nothing Good or Desirable; yet being Instituted by God, it was to be observed, as such, and the *Uncircumcised Man-Child* was to be Cut off from his People, as a Breaker of God's Covenant. See *Gen.* 17. 14.

Among the Reasons *Alphonsus* offers for the avoiding of Oaths, he urgeth the Authority of the Saints, "which, saith he, do seem to forbid all Oaths to Christians, *Treat. of Oaths*, p. 135. Seem to forbid, &c. is an Expression that intimates, that neither He nor They were Positive, as to the Prohibition of All Oaths.

Joac. Camer. and *P. Loseler Villerius*, whose *Marginal Note* upon *Mat.* 5. 37. the *Essayer* cites, p. 27. viz. "Whatever you Vouch, Vouch it barely; and whatever you Deny, Deny it barely, without any more Words; do not exclude All Swearing, but By-Oaths, or Indirect Forms of Speech, as their Note upon *Ver.* 33. intimates.

Tho' Beza, that Famous Professor of Divinity at Geneva, and whom the *Essayer* places among the Best and most Enlightned Men of those Times, p. 28. saith on *James* 5. 12. "That which you have to Say or Affirm, Speak or Affirm it simply, and without an Oath; and that you have to Deny, Deny it simply and flatly;" yet in his *Annotations* upon *Mat.* 5. 34. he tells us what his Judgment was about

Ex quibus liquet indirectas Jurandi Species, non ipsum Jusjurandum legitime conceptum reprehendi; ac proinde Universalem Particulam a nonnullis temere hoc loco urgeri.

Swearing, where he saith, "It is evident from Christ's Words, that Indirect Kinds or Forms of Swearing are to be blamed, and not an Oath it self, Lawfully Conceived or Taken; and that therefore the Universal Particle [*At all*] is Rashly Urged by some in this Place.

Otho Brunfelsius, on *Mat.* 5. is brought also to Serve the Cause, *Essay*, p. 28. but to as little Purpose as any of the fore-

forementioned Authors. For had the *Essayer* quoted the whole Passage, as it is in the *Treatise of Oaths*, p. 114. from whence he took but a Part, he might have seen, that that Author oppugns not the Use of *All Oaths*, but Frequent or Common Swearing; It is a Proverb, saith he, *None is less trusted, than he which shall often Swear.*

The Jesuite *Suarez* (who is quoted *Essay*, p. 32. from the *Treat. of Oaths*, p. 142. and to which Quotation, the *Essayer* hath put this Marginal Note, viz. *The Sacred Name not to be mixt with the Concerns or Business of Men*) was not against *All Swearing*; for in a Book, Intituled, *The Practical Divinity of the Papists, discover'd to be Destructive of Christianity and Men's Souls*, London, Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst* and *Nath. Ponder*, in the Year 1676. p. 214. he is there cited to allow of an *Affertory Oath*. *Suarez de Jur.* l. 3. c. 12. n. 3.

And in the same Book (viz. *The Practical Divinity, &c.* aforesaid, p. 215, 216.) he is quoted to be so great a Favourer of Swearing in some Cases, as to grant Liberty, even of being Perjured. "He that Swears the Truth, *Qui jurat Veritatem, credens esse* saith he, "believing it to be False, and *Falsum quod jurat, &c. De Juram. l. 3. c. 4. n. 7.* "takes notice that he Swears, but minds "not what he Swears, Sins not Adortally. "Or, if he neither regards the one, nor "the other, but does both without Consideration, it is only "a Light Venial Fault.

See what an Author this Jesuite is against *All Swearing*, who makes so Light a Matter of Perjury it self, allowing a Man to Swear in some Cases, that which he believes to be False.

Bp. Gauden's Opinion about the Prohibition of Swearing has been shewn before, p. 141, 142. to make nothing for the *Essayer*.

And *Bp. Taylor*, whom the *Essayer* cites, p. 41. cannot be understood in an Unlimited Sense, as one against *All Swearing*, or *Affirming in the Name of God,*

God, in *Terrene Affairs*. For having consider'd the Opinion of the *Anabaptists*, (*Liberty of Propheſying*, Sect. 18.) against the *Baptism of Infants*, with great Freedom, and Variety of Arguments in behalf of their Practice; he ſaith, "But then for their other
 " *Capital Opinion*, with all its Branches, That it is
 " not lawful for Princes to put Malefactors to
 " Death, nor to take up Defensive Arms, nor to
 " *Minister an Oath*, nor to Contend in Judgment,
 " it is not to be Disputed with ſuch Liberty, as the
 " former, *Ibid.* Sect. 19.

And in his *Ductor Dubitantium*, Edit. 4. 1696. he ſaith,—"An *Oath* muſt be of a thing ſo ſure, that
 " nothing can be a Cause of Doubt, &c. p. 796. Adding in the ſame Page, by way of Caution,
 " No Man muſt *Swear* a thing is ſo, and yet at laſt
 " ſay, I did *Bona Fide* Suppoſe it ſo; but I Examined
 " it, I Search'd as well as I could, I enter'd into
 " all the Corners of it, I had great Reasons to Be-
 " lieve, I had fair Affurances it was ſo, and I am
 " every Day aſſur'd of many things, of which I had
 " leſs Teſtimony.

He that duly conſiders theſe Paſſages, cannot be induced to think, that the Biſhop was a *Non-Juror*, or a *Non-Affirmer*.

4. Our *Ancient Friends and Brethren*, in their ſaid Treatiſe of Oaths, and Declaration aforeſaid, are either Ignorantly Miſtaken, or Wilfully Miſrepreſented by the *Effayer*. For the *Treatiſe of Oaths* was written againſt *All Swearing*, but not againſt *Solemn Affirming in the Name of God*; ſee Sect. VI. p. 48. compared with p. 58. of this *Answer*. For had it been intended againſt *Solemn Affirming*, &c. the *Authors* thereof would have been Transgreſſors of their own Doctrine, who, to get Credit to their Speech with the Government, uſe no leſs than *Three Solemn Affirmations*, as, "We Speak not Boaſtingly, but
 " with Humility, Before the Great Lord of Heaven
 " and Earth, *Treat. of Oaths*, p. 13.

" It

"It is Known to *Almighty God*, and we most
 "Heartily Desire it may be Known and Believed
 "by you, [*viz. the King and Parliament*] that, &c.
Ibid. p. 152.

And "We Profess our Selves in the Fear of *Almighty God*, &c. *Ibid.* p. 155. See Sect. IV. p. 26. of this Answer.

'Tis strange, that those *Ancient Friends and Brethren* should design that *Treatise* against *All Solemn Affirming in the Name of God*, and yet use it *Thrice* in the said *Treatise*, if they believed it to be more than *Tea* or *Nay*.

And as for the *Declaration* aforesaid, *viz.* of 1666, out of which the *Essayer* takes a Quotation, which he says, "Is very Apostolical and Harmonious with, "our Whole System of True Divinity, *Essay*, p. 23, Endeavouring to make the *Reader* believe, (as is said before, Sect. VI. p. 40.) "That the *Apostles* "Preached, and the *Martyrs* Suffered for the Form "of Words, *Tea, Tea, or Nay, Nay*, as such: As nothing can be fairly Collected from that *Paper* against the *Present Solemn Affirmation*, because the *Tea, Tea, or Nay, Nay*, which the *Subscribers* thereof say, they would *Stand By* and *To*, doth not exclude the Use of other Words in Cases of Evidence, &c. For the *Essayer* himself acknowledgeth, That "there is scarce "any Case, but where more Words are required, "either by way of Information, Explanation, or "Exception, &c. Essentially Necessary to the Evidence it self, *Essay*, p. 30. And as the *Testimonies* of *Friends* before-cited, together with those in the *Epistle from the Meeting for Sufferings*, and the *Letter from a Satisfied to a Dissatisfied Friend*, &c. do abundantly prove the Lawfulness of Reverent Using the Name of God in a Solemn Affirmation in Terrene Affairs: So I have the Testimony of our Ancient and Faithful Friend *George Whitehead*, a Person of Unquestionable Credit and Veracity, who was one of the *Subscribers* of the said *Paper*, and very well knew

what their Sentiments were about *Standing By* and *To* their *Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay*; in his *Letter* to me, dated, *London* the 30th of the 11th Month, 1713. wherein he discovers such a Clearness of Intellect, and Solidity of Judgment, wherewith the Lord hath blessed him in his Honourable Old-Age, that what he writes is Weighty, and deserves a most Serious Consideration.

“ To thy Enquiry about our *Standing By* and *To*
 “ our *Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay, &c.* against *Swearing*,
 “ Answer, (*saith he*) We never did or could there-
 “ by intend, to Exclude the Presence of God, or His
 “ Fear, or Name, in Bearing Witness to the Truth,
 “ for the Credit thereof, when called thereto.

“ And even the *Dissatisfied* have Granted, we
 “ may use that Sacred Name in Attesting the
 “ Truth, (in Matters of Moment) as, In the Presence,
 “ or Fear of God, if we have an Immediate Sense
 “ thereof, or Motion thereto. Whence it follows,
 “ that such Attestation is neither Breach of Christ’s
 “ Command, nor Cometh of Evil: For neither God,
 “ nor his Fear, can Move to, or Allow the Breach
 “ of his Son’s Command.

“ And surely we never Intended such a Solemn Af-
 “ firmation for those, who can Use the Sacred Name
 “ of God, without his Fear, or Sense of his Presence;
 “ but for the People of God, called *Quakers*, who
 “ truly Fear him, and therefore must be Sensible of
 “ his Presence in Testifying the Truth.

“ As we are Commanded to *Let our Yea be Yea,*
 “ and our *Nay, Nay*, James 5. 12. This we *Stand By*
 “ and *To*; and that according to Christ’s and his
 “ Apostle’s Command: *Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay*, in
 “ Truth, are not Inconsistent with the Name of
 “ God, but Agreeable to the Reverent Use thereof,
 “ both according to Scripture, and our Faithful Bre-
 “ thren’s Testimonies. See our Printed Epistle from
 “ the Meeting for Sufferings, in 1696. p. 3, 7, 8.

So that they did not understand, that *Yea, Yea,* or *Nay, Nay,* related to the *Mode* or *Manner of Speech*, as the *Essayer* Mistakes or Perverts their Meaning, p. 24. but to the *Truth of Affirming* or *Denying*; believing there was no Inconsistency in *Yea, Yea,* and *Nay, Nay,* with the *Name of God*, but an Agreeableness to the *Reverent Use* thereof; and that it was Lawful for them to Declare *In the Presence of God*, or *in his Fear*, or *Name*, in Bearing Witness to the *Truth*, for the Credit thereof, when called thereto.

Their Testimony, as it appears from the *Paper* it self, was against *All Swearing*, and for Standing by and to *Yea, Yea,* and *Nay, Nay,* in Cases of Evidence, &c. And from the *Letter* we are inform'd, they were never against the *Present Affirmation*; nor did think, that to *Declare in the Presence of God*, or that *God is Witness to the Truth declared*, was an *Oath*, without some *Imprecation* or *Curse*, or *Invoking of God to Vengeance*, *Conditionally Contained*, or *Included in the Form of an Oath*, as *G. Whitehead* is quoted before, p. 121.

And this is the Truth of the Matter; for 'tis the *Imprecation*, either Expressed or Necessarily Understood, that makes an *Oath*, as used among Men, see Sect. II. p. 11, 12, 13, 14.

Very Pertinent to this Purpose, is that Passage in the *Letter from a Satisfied to a Dissatisfied Friend*; " 'Tis therefore, saith the Author, an Imprecation, " or Calling upon God for a Curse, that is Essential in Speech to make an Oath. --- And that 'tis " not the Name of the Lord, barely used in a Form " of Speech, --- that makes that Form of Speech an " Oath; Nor is it Essential to an Oath, that the " Name of God be used in the Form of Words " thereof. So that Men may Name the LORD in " a Form of Speech without Swearing; and Men " may Swear by the LORD, without Naming him in " their Speech, p. 31. Whereof he gives Instances, p. 32.

And with the *Letter*, agrees the *Essayer*, who saith, "*Gen. 31. 53. And Jacob sware by the Fear of his Father Isaac, which was an Oath, without Expressing the Sacred Name; tho' it must be allowed to imply the God his Father Isaac feared, Essay, p. 6. So speaking of David's Swearing, 2 Sam. 3. 35. and of the Spies, Josh. 2. 14. he saith, 'Only David expresses the Name of God, theirs imply it; Ibid. p. 7. Again, 'Some Solemn Forms, being so accounted [viz. Oaths] wherein the Sacred Name hath not been express'd, Ibid. p. 8. So that he allows some Forms to be Oaths, wherein the Name of God is not mentioned, because (as in the Instance of the Spies to Rahab, Our Life for yours) an Imprecation is as really Implied, as if the Words of an Imprecation had been Expressed, see Essay, p. 15.*

But in Contradiction to this, he saith, "That when Oaths were Lawful, it was judged a Swearing by the Name of God to attest it, without such Additions of Speech, as aforesaid, *Ibid. p. 4. viz. As in Abraham's Case, when Abimelech said unto him, Now therefore Swear unto me by God, Gen. 21. 23. and in Saul's Oath to Jonathan, And Saul sware, As the Lord liveth, he shall not be slain, 1 Sam. 19. 6. And to the Witch of Endor, And Saul sware to her by the Lord, saying, As the Lord liveth, there shall no Punishment, &c. 1 Sam. 28. 10. And likewise that of David to Bathsheba, And the King sware, and said, As the Lord liveth, who hath redeemed my Soul, &c. 1 Kings 1. 29. See Essay, p. 3.*

For the *Essayer* is under a great Mistake, in saying, *It was judged a Swearing by the Name of God to attest it, without such Additions of Speech, as aforesaid; that is, swear, or swear by God, or swear by the Lord. For it is fully proved, Sect. VII. p. 61, &c. of this Answer, that the Words, The Lord liveth, or, As the Lord liveth, were not in themselves, simply consider'd, an Oath, without the Word Swear express'd, or some Words annex'd that necessarily imply'd*

an *Oath*; that is, No Form of Speech whatsoever, either by way of *Attestation*, *Invocation*, or *Asseveration*, either *was* or *is* an *Oath*, without an *Imprecation* Express'd, or necessarily Understood: This, I say, is fully Proved there, and let the *Essayer*, or that *some more Able Hand*, he speaks of, p. 74. Disprove it, if they can.

If it should be objected, That the *Essayer* owns, "there is an *Imprecation* either Express'd or Understood in some *Oaths*."

I answer, He doth, *Essay*, p. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. But then his making a Difference between *Formal Imprecations*, and *Asseverations*, which (he saith) were likewise accounted *Oaths*, p. 44. shews, that his Opinion is, that there are some *Oaths*, which have no *Imprecations* either Express'd or Implied; and This Notion of his I Oppose, as contrary to the whole Current of Scripture.

But he seeing, he could not attack the *Present Affirmation*, without such a False Medium, he hath boldly adventured upon it, tho' to the apparent Prejudice of his Cause.

Now the Instance he gives, p. 44, 45. to Invalidate the *Present Affirmation*, is taken from the *Treatise of Oaths*, p. 18. which, because he hath Partially quoted, I shall cite it as 'tis in the *Treatise*; "English Custom hath very much overgone English Law in this Business of *Oaths*; they were anciently but Solemn Attestations, As the Lord liveth, &c. which are now improv'd to *Imprecations*, So help me God, and the Contents of this Book. And from this Instance he concludes, that They [the Authors of the *Treatise*] Judged them [Solemn Attestations] Unlawful. And to make the Reader believe, that those Authors understood, by Solemn Attestations, Scaring Asseverations, he takes a Quotation from the said *Treatise*, p. 27. and Tacks it to p. 18. which is nothing to his Purpose. For the Scaring Asseverations, which they complain of, p. 27. were not the Solemn Attestations.

Attestations, which are mentioned p. 18. before they were improved to *Imprecations*, as he would have it, but afterwards: For that which makes *Asseverations* *Scaring*, is those *Horrible Imprecations* accompanying them, as the Context there shews, p. 27.

But for a further Elucidation of the Meaning of those Authors, p. 18. it is to be noted, that they speak there by way of *Prolepsis*, or Anticipation, a Figurative Speech, wherein we call a Thing beforehand by that Name, which it afterwards takes, by the Addition of somewhat more: So that *Solemn Attestations* are there called *Oaths*, not because they were so of themselves, without the Addition of somewhat more, but by way of *Prolepsis*, or Anticipation; they being then *Oaths*, when *Imprecations* were afterwards added to them.

Of this Figurative Way of Speaking by Anticipation, the Scripture affords many Examples; whereof I shall produce these that follow.

In *Gen. 12. 5.* mention is made of *Bethel*, in *Abraham's* Time, tho' it had its Name given it afterwards by his Grandson *Jacob*, *Gen. 28. 19.*

In *Gen. 13. 10.* and *14. 2.* we read of the City *Zoar*, which was afterwards so called from the Event that followed, *Gen. 19. 22.*

In *Gen. 21. 14.* 'tis said of *Hagar*, that she departed and wandered in the Wilderness of *Beer-sheba*; when the Place was afterwards so called from the Covenant made between *Abraham* and *Abimelech*, *v. 31.* *Beer-sheba* signifying, the Well of the Oath.

In *1 Sam. 4. 1.* and *5. 1.* mention is made of *Eben-ezer*, which was so called by *Samuel*, *1 Sam. 7. 12.* who after the Victory that *Israel* obtained over the *Philistines*, took a Stone, and set up between *Mizpeh* and *Shen*, and called the Name of it *Eben-ezer*, saying, *Hitherto hath the Lord helped us.* See other Examples in *Numb. 13. 23, 24.* *Judges 2. 1, 5.* and *15. 9, 17.* *1 Chron. 14. 11.* in which Places there is an Anticipated Mentioning of things.

Besides,

Besides, if the *Authors* of the *Treatise of Oaths* had accounted *Solemn Attestations* to be *Oaths*; is it consistent with the least degree of Probability, that they should in that very *Treatise*, which was written against *All Oaths*, use *Three Solemn Attestations, Affirmations or Asseverations*, as is already instanced, p. 26, and 152, 153. of this *Answer*? And argue, as they do, to Vindicate the Apostle *Paul* from *Swearing*, by this *Medium*, viz. That he never used the Word *Oath* or *Swear* in his *Asseverations*,---and lay it down for a Positive Conclusion, "That such as will have "it that *Paul* Swore, must bring the Word *Swear* or "Oath to prove it, *Treat. of Oaths*, p. 103.

Could any Men Speak thus in Vindication of the Apostle *Paul* from *Swearing*, and yet at the same time be of Opinion, that *Solemn Attestations*, or *Asseverations*, Simply Consider'd, without an *Imprecation* express'd or implied, were *Oaths*?

The *Present Affirmation* is by the *Essayer*, p. 45. falsely placed amongst *Swearing Asseverations*, such, As *the Lord lives*, or, *The Lord lives*, which with him are *Oaths*; and makes, as tho' the *Authors* of the *Treatise of Oaths* intended, by the Word *Swearing*, a Stroke against it: Yea, he positively says, p. 43. The "*Friends*,--- with the *Bishop*, [viz. *Bp. Taylor*] "have affixed a Judgment upon the *Affirmation*. And what's that Judgment? Why 'tis a Condemning it as a *Taking of the Lord's Name in Vain*. But is it not very strange, that *Friends* with the *Bishop* should affix a Judgment upon the *Present Affirmation* Twenty Years before it was in Being? (For the *Treatise of Oaths* was Printed in the Year 1675. and the *Present Affirmation* pass'd in the Year 1696.) And at a Time, when none of those *Friends* had the least *Scruple*, about the Lawfulness of Reverent Using the Name of God in a *Solemn Affirmation* in *Terrene Affairs*, as in *Cases of Evidence*, &c?

Who can but admire the *Essayer's* Prodigious Penetration into Things at such a Distance; and so long

long before any *Doubt*, not to say *Controversie*, was raised about the *Present Affirmation*?

But as he is to be admired for his Wonderful Insight into a mere *Non-entity*; so for his rare Ability, in Arguing against the *Present Affirmation*. For who could think, that any, besides himself, should ever Argue at such a Rate as this? "If such Asseverations [*viz.* *Scaring*, or *Oaths*, *Treat. of Oaths*, p. 27.] "are not Lawful now, how then comes the "*Present Affirmation* so to be? Or what is that less "*than the other*, [*viz.* a *Scaring Asseveration*] --- "*The Lord lives. ---- In the Presence of God, the Witness of, &c.* *Essay*, p. 45. For tho' to say, *The Lord lives*, and to Declare in the Presence of God, the Witness of, &c. are *Equipollent Propositions*; yet they are not *Scaring Asseverations*, or *Oaths*, as he would insinuate. For that which makes an *Asseveration Scaring*, or an *Oath*, is the *Imprecation*, and nothing else; as hath been often shewn. But the *Essayer* Confounds things, which should be, as they really are in themselves, Distinguished. For tho' All *Oaths* were *Asseverations*, yet All *Asseverations* were not *Oaths*. But when he says, "Not only the *Present Formal Imprecations*, but *Asseverations* were "likewise accounted *Oaths*, p. 44. he plainly intimates, that there were Some *Asseverations* that were *Oaths*, and yet had no *Imprecation* in them. And what he there Intimates, he confidently Asserts in another Place, saying, "To bring a *Mode*, "or *Form of Speech* under the Prohibition of "Christ, it is not absolutely necessary that it should "be an *Imprecation*, p. 87.

But what is it that *Christ* prohibits? Is it not All Swearing? *I say unto you, Swear not at all*; see *Essay*, p. 86. How then can a *Mode or Form of Speech* fall under the Prohibition of *Christ*, that is not an *Oath*? And if it is an *Oath*, that falls under his Prohibition; which the *Essayer* affirms, saying, "The *Oaths* which "Christ prohibited under the Gospel, are such and
"such

" such like Oaths, which God permitted and com-
 " manded under the Law, p. 88. And " It is not ab-
 " solutely necessary that it should be an *Imprecation*,
 p. 87. Then, according to him, there are *some Oaths*
 without any *Imprecation*. And one of the Reasons
 that he assigns in Proof of his Assertion is, " The Holy
 " Scriptures --- inform us, that Plain Asseverations
 " have been accounted Oaths ; --- yea, that *The Lord*
 " *liveth*, (which is but a Plain Asseveration) was the
 " Legal Oath appointed to be made use of by the
 " Lord himself, *Ibid.* But this Reason is of no
 Force or Validity at all ; for tho' the *Essayer* brings
 it to prove, that the *Lord liveth*, is an *Asseveration*,
 or, as he would have it, an *Oath*, without an *Im-*
precation, yet he makes it *Imprecatory*, p. 17. where
 he saith, " When Men say, *The Lord lives* (it being
 " spoken to confirm something else, to which it
 " hath not a necessary Relation) it is natural to in-
 " fer, He lives to take Cognizance of the Truth or
 " Falsity of the Attestation, and punish accordingly.
 So that when the *Essayer* pleaseth, *The Lord liveth*,
 is a Mode or Form of Speech that hath no *Impre-*
cation ; and again, when the Fancy takes him, it
 is Natural to infer an *Imprecation* in it. Yea, tho'
 he acknowledges, " There are divers Forms of
 " Speech used by the Apostle of as high a Signi-
 " fication as the *Present Affirmation*," p. 46. tho' in
 a Terrene Affair ; for Instances are before given in
 this *Treatise*, p. 19, wherein the Apostle so used
 the *Name of God* ; as, *Before God I lie not*, &c. yet
 " if they [*viz.* Men] say, *God is Witness* (it being
 " used as aforesaid) it is Natural to infer, He is
 " desired, or intended to be Witness against them,
 " if they speak not the Truth, &c. Essay, p. 17.
 Whence it follows, that when the Apostle Attests
 the *Name of God* in a Terrene Affair, it is no *Oath* ;
 but if others so Attest it, according to the *Essayer*,
 it is an *Oath*.

Quo teneam Vultus mutantem Protea nodo? Hor. l. 1.

Ep. 1. v. 90.

He changeth Shapes so oft; tell, if thou hast
A Knot to hold this Varying Proteus fast.

A Brief ADVERTISEMENT about the Foregoing Quotations out of the Antient Fathers, &c.

LEST it should be objected, That if the Ancient Fathers, *Athanasius, Casarius, Chrysostom, &c.* and some other Writers, quoted in the *Essay and Treatise of Oaths*, as also those Fathers cited by Bp. *Gauden*, whereof *Origen* is one, whom I have quoted against *All Swearing, Melius Inquirendum*, p. 121. were not against *All Oaths* in any Case, then I have not only Contradicted my self, and the *Treatise of Oaths*, but have also weakened our Testimony against *Swearing*; I desire the Reader to observe,

1. That I have not Contradicted my self; for 'tis the Bishop that quotes *Origen* for *Some Swearing*, and not I. What I have done upon this Head, is to shew, that the *Essayer's* Pretences to *Ancient and Modern Authorities* do All fail him; there being not One of them [*viz.* of those he quotes] against *All Swearing*, or *Affirming in the Name of God*.

2. As for the *Treatise of Oaths*, I have a very great Esteem of it; and whatever Conclusions the *Essayer* draws therefrom, against the *Present Solemn Affirmation*, I cannot, upon the most Exact and Impartial Enquiry I am able to make, be of his Opinion; but am perswaded, that the Weighty Arguments therein used against *Swearing*, are so many Substantial Reasons for *Solemn Affirming*. It was a Work of great Labour to Collect the Numerous Testimonies in that *Treatise*; and therefore the less Wonder, that in so Voluminous a Search and Transcription, some Mistakes have happen'd: The not Detecting of which, considering the Ill Use the *Essayer* makes of them, had been a Treble Injury, *viz.* against
Himself,

Himself, the Treatise, and the Reader; against himself, in not shewing him the Mistakes; against the Treatise, in not Correcting its Errata; and against the Reader, in suffering him to be imposed upon in an Affair of such great Importance.

3. Our Testimony against *Swearing* is not hereby Weakened or Impaired, but rather Confirmed and Strengthened: For 'tis an Addition of Strength to a Testimony, when those things are removed, which obstructed the Force of its Evidence. Truth stands in no need of Artifice to support it, but then appears in its fullest Strength, when presented in its own Plainness and Simplicity.

It may not now be unseasonable to Expostulate a little with the *Essayer*, and ask him what he thinks of his Vain-glorious Harangue? p. 82. Hath he not Sung his *Epinicium* too soon, even before he obtained the Victory? And hath he not imposed upon his Reader a False Muster-Roll of Authorities, to maintain a Weak and Languishing Cause? Hath he learnt this Disingenuous Practice of the *Popish* Writers, who, to put a Fair Gloss upon their Foul Errors, cry out *Antiquity, Universality and Consent*? And make their Boasts of the *Primitive Christians, Suffering Martyrs, Ancient Fathers and Learned Doctors*, as so many Patrons and Abettors of their Unscriptural Tenents? When *Jewel, Bilson, Du Moulin*, and other Learned Protestants have by uncontestable Proofs demonstrated the contrary. I cannot but Grieve and Lament, to find a Friend, or at least one who pretends to that Honourable Appellation, in the Camp of Professed Enemies; shall a * *Philothrenes*, or a *Fisher*,

* Out of this NAME, at the End of the Preface to the *Position or Testimony against All Swearing*, Printed 1692. allowing Ph to stand for F, the Reader may Spell *John Fisher*. And if we compare the *Position* and *Essay* together, we shall find such a Likeness of Style, Identity of Matter, and Resemblance in the Manner of Arguing in both, that we may fairly Conjecture they had the same Author.

act the Part of a *Harding*, a *Bellarmin*, or *Person*?
 O, Tell it not in Gath, Publish it not in the Streets of
 Askelon: lest the Daughters of the Philistins Rejoice,
 lest the Daughters of the Uncircumcised Triumph,
 2 Sam. i. 20.

————— Pudet hæc opprobria (*certè*)
 Et dici potuisse, & non potuisse refelli.

Ovid. *Met.* l. i. v. 758, 759.

Great Shame it is, that such Reproach should lye
 Against the Essayer, which he can't deny.

I have spent, I confess, many Pages in this Col-
 lection of Testimonies; but I saw there was a Ne-
 cessity thereof, one Principal Part of the *Present*
Controversie depending upon it; and therefore I shall
 make no other Apology for what I have done upon
 this great *Occasion*, than to tell the *Reader*, That the
 Glory of God, the Honour of Truth, the Peace of
 the Church, the Reputation of our Ancient Friends,
 the Satisfaction of Scrupulous Consciences, the Si-
 lencing of Gainfayers, and the Necessary Defence of
 the *Solemn Affirmation*, Indispensably Required it.

I proceed now to the *Second Part* of this Eighth
 Section; namely,

II. To Answer some Objections against a Form.

I HAVE observed, that when some *Dissatisfied*
Friends have had little or nothing to say against
 the *Affirmation* it self, then they have cry'd out a-
 gainst a *Form*.

Obj. 1. The *Present Affirmation* is a *Form*, and
 therefore may not be Used by us, who are Redeemed out
 of *Forms* to *Life* and *Power*.

Ans. 'Tis granted to be a *Form*; but 'tis a *Form*
 of *Sound Words*, 2 Tim. i. 13. and surely such a *Form*
 which the *Apottle* exhorted *Timothy* to *Hold Fast*,
 cannot justly be excepted against; neither are *Life*
 and

and Power opposite to, but most consistent with it. *A Form of Truth*, as well as *A Form of Godliness*, may be without *The Power*, but *The Power of Truth*, in whomsoever it is, is not separated from *The Form of Truth*. He that shall adventure to deny this, must deny the Argument the *Apostle's Exhortation* is grounded upon. Hold fast, saith he, *the Form of Sound Words*, which thou hast heard of me, in Faith and Love which is in Christ Jesus. And this is pressed upon him by another Motive, Ver. 14. *That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us.* Where he calls *The Form of Sound Words*, *That Good Thing*, which is to be held fast and kept in Christian Faith and Love, by the Inhabitation of the *Holy Ghost*. And where Christian Faith and Love are, there the *Holy Ghost dwells*; and where he dwells, there is Power. 'Tis true, (and there is Cause of great Lamentation that it is so) *A Form of Sound Words* may be, and is too often held without *The Power*; but *The Power*, which is *The Holy Ghost dwelling in the Faithful*, cannot be in them divided from *The Form of Sound Words*. To suppose a Possibility of the Contrary, would be a Contradiction to the *Promise of Christ*, who promised, that the *Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost*, John 14. 26. and the *Spirit of Truth*, should guide the Faithful into all Truth, see John 16. 13. So that *The Spirit of Truth*, both in Himself and in the Faithful, is inseparable from *The Doctrine of Truth*, or *The Form of Sound Words*; for as he is the *Spirit of Truth*, so he leadeth the Faithful into all Truth, necessary to Eternal Life and Salvation. Let none think, that this is a Confining or Tying *The Spirit of Truth* to *A Form of Sound Words*, and that it will follow from hence, that they who have *A Form thereof*, have also *The Spirit of Truth*; for 'tis acknowledged before, and sad Experience is a Confirmation of it, that *A Form* may be, and too frequently is, without *The Power*: But let them deduce this True Conclusion

tion from the Premises, That *The Spirit of Truth, or Holy Ghost*, which dwelleth in the Faithful, doth Lead them, as they Sincerely Obey him, into *All Truth*, and consequently into *The Form of sound Words*, to the *Holding fast* of which *Timothy* was Exhorted by the *Apostle*.

Obj. 2. Another Objection against the Present Affirmation is, That 'tis a *Form of Words* wherein the Sacred Name of God is used to Bind the Speech in *Terrene Affairs*, and therefore not to be complied with, being more than *Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay*, commanded by our Saviour.

Ans. 1. The Sacred Name of God is used in the Present Affirmation in *Terrene Affairs*, but not to Bind the Speech under an *Imprecation* or *Curse* to be inflicted upon the Affirmer, in case of his not Speaking or Acting in Truth and Righteousness. In this Sense the Affirmer neither Binds himself, nor his Speech. If he does, there should be some Words in the Present Affirmation, that express or imply an Imprecation; but there's no Imprecation in the Words, *I do Declare*, they are a Plain and Simple Form of Speaking, as Inoffensive, as it's Equivalent, *I say*; nor in the Words, *In the Presence of Almighty God*; for there's no Curse there; *For in his Presence is Fulness of Joy*, Psal. 16. 11. Nor in these, *The Witness of the Truth of what I say*; for as he is Truth it self, so he Loves the Truth, and is a Witness of it, and in it is no Lye, and therefore no Imprecation or Curse. If then there is no Imprecation in the several Parts of the Present Affirmation, either express'd or implied, there can be none in it taken together: For here the old Maxim holds good, *Eadem est Ratio Totius & Partium*; The Reason is the same for the Whole, as for the Parts. For the Whole cannot differ from all its Parts taken together and united: Because all the Parts taken together and united, are the very same with the Whole, it being impossible to conceive any thing in the

the *Whole*, which is not in the *United Parts*; or, in the *United Parts*, which is not in the *Whole*.

The Consequence of this Argument is Self-Evident, viz. That if there is no Imprecation Express'd or Implied, either in the *Parts* or in the *Whole* of the *Present Affirmation*, then there is no Imprecation in it; but the *Former* is True, and therefore the *Latter*.

If any shall Slight this Kind of Proof for none other Reason, but because it is *Logical*; by the same Rule, all the *Syllogistical* Arguments of *S. Fisher*, *R. Barclay*, *W. Penn*, and *Rog. Haydock* may be rejected, see Sect. 7. p. 69, 70. Nay, what will become of the Arguments of our Saviour, *Mat. 22. 31, 32.* compared with *Luke 20. 37, 38.* and of the Apostle *Paul*, *1 Cor. 15. 12, 13, 14, 15. &c.* which *Logically* prove the *Resurrection of the Dead*, against the Cavilling Objections of the *Sadducees* and *Epiphanians*? Either Religion is a *Reasonable* or *Logical Service*, or it is not; *Λογική Λατρεία*, if it is not, how can it be adapted *Rom. 12. 1.* to our Capacities, who are endued with Rational Faculties? If it is, (as who will say otherwise, but *Romantick Enthusiasts*, or *Senseless Bigots*?) Then certainly we are to use Right Reason in our Disquisitions about it. I have often thought in my most retired Meditations, and I am daily more and more, by the Grace of God, confirmed in it, that the Christian Religion is, of all things in the World, the most Consistent to the Dictates of Right Reason. 'Tis always so in *it self*, and then comes to be so *unto us*, when the Eyes of our Understandings are Savingly Enlightened in the Excellency of the Knowledge of Christ Jesus, and the Mysteries of the Gospel are opened unto us by the Spirit of Wisdom and Revelation. O how Reasonable doth it appear then to the Enlightened and Sanctified Souls, that they should Worship God, who is a Spirit, in Spirit and in Truth!

Truth! How Reasonable are all the Commands of Christ! How easy his Yoke, and how light his Burden! His Ways are Ways of Pleasantness, and all his Paths are Peace.

Ans. 2. The using the *Sacred Name of God* in the *Present Affirmation*, is *Declarative only*, *I do Declare in the Presence of Almighty God, &c.* I do not properly *Bind my Speech* by it, but as I am a Christian, I desire to do this to the *Glory of God*, who is to be *Glorified* in all we do, see *1 Cor. 10. 31.* But how can we do all to his *Glory*, if in *Terrene Affairs*, we may not so much as make mention of his *Name*? Certainly *Solomon* intended no such thing, when he made the *Acknowledging of God* in all our *Ways*, our *Indispensable Duty*, *In all thy Ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy Paths*, *Prov. 3. 6.* Nor did our *Saviour*, when he said, *Are not five Sparrows sold for two Farthings, and not one of them is forgotten* *ἑνὸς πικίου τὸ θες*, *Before God*, or as the Words signify, *In the Sight or Presence of God*, *Luke 12. 6.* *Are not Sparrows*, and the selling of them for *Farthings*, *Terrene Affairs*? I know the Words of our *Saviour* are put by way of *Question*; but the plain *Resolution* of them is into this *Solemn Affirmation*, *Five Sparrows are sold for two Farthings, and not one of them is forgotten Before God.*

Nor did the *Apostle James*, *Chap. 4. 13, 14, 15.* a Place already spoken to.

Nor the *Apostle Peter*, in the Case of *Ananias* and *Sapphira* his *Wife*, who *Sold a Possession*, and kept back part of the *Price*, his *Wife* also being privy to it, and brought a certain Part, and laid it at the *Apostles Feet*. But *Peter* said, *Ananias*, *Why hath Satan filled thine Heart to Lye to the Holy Ghost?* *Whiles it remained, was it not thine own?* *and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?* *Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine Heart?* *thou hast not lied unto Men, but unto God.* — Again, *Peter* said unto *Sapphira*, *How is it that ye have agreed together, to Tempt the Spirit of the Lord?*

Lord? Acts 5. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9. Here the Affair was Terrene, and yet *Peter* makes use of the Name of *Holy Ghost, God, and the Spirit of the Lord*, in his Discourse about it.

And as to the Apostle *Paul*, tho' Examples are already given of his Using the Name of God in Terrene Affairs, p. 19, 26. yet I shall mention Two more, because so pertinent to the Matter in Hand.

The first is in *Acts* 27. where is a Solemn Affirmation in a Temporal Affair, with an Attestation of God, to gain Credit to his Speech.

There shall be no loss, saith he, of any Man's Life among you, but of the Ship, ver. 22.

For there stood by me this Night, the Angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, ver. 23.

Saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Cæsar: and lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee, ver. 24.

Wherefore, Sirs, be of good Cheer; for I believe God, that it shall be even as it was told me, ver. 25.

This Example is so plain and obvious, that it needs no Paraphrase to explain, or Argument to inforce it.

The second is in *2 Tim.* 4. where the Apostle charges him before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall Judge the Quick and the Dead at his Appearing and Kingdom, ver. 1. Saying, *Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me,* ver. 9. --- *Take Mark, and bring him with thee,* --- ver. 11. *The Cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the Books, but especially the Parchments,* ver. 13.

Timothy's Coming, Bringing Mark, the Apostle's Cloke, Books and Parchments, were questionless Terrene Affairs: But doth the Apostle scruple the Using of the Sacred Name of God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, upon this Occasion? No; He Obligeth Timothy to the Performance of what he Enjoyned him, by a Divine Sanction, *I Charge thee before God, &c.*

Which Solemn Charge is prefix'd, and hath respect to every Precept he gives *Timothy* in this *Chapter*, let the Subject-matter be either Religious or Terrene.

Thus we have the Example of *Christ himself*, our Lord and Master, who cannot be said, without Blasphemy, to be a Transgressor of his own Precept; and of his Hqly Apostles, *James, Peter and Paul*, for our Imitation and Practice. And for my part, I do believe it my Incumbent Duty, according to the Measure of his Grace, which the Lord hath bestowed upon me, to endeavour, as much as in me lies, the Exaltation of his Name; and Promotion of his Glory, in all my Words and Actions, and that in all Companies and Places. For, for what End is Speech, the Interpreter of our Thoughts, and the Copy of that Original which is in the Mind, given to us, but to Speak the Truth to one another, and to Pray to, and Celebrate the Praises of the Donor?

Ans. 3. Nor is the *Present Affirmation* more than *Yea, Yea, or Nay, Nay*; that is, in Sense and Signification: For 'tis not the *Sound* of those Words, but the *Meaning*, that we are to have Regard unto. And if the *Meaning*, then it is most certain, that our *Saviour* hath put no *Negative* upon the *Reverent Using of the Name of God* in Terrene Affairs.

But, saith the *Essayer*, "It [*viz. the Present Affirmation*] "is certainly a Taking of the Name of "the Lord in Vain, and consequently a Breach of "that Command, *Exod. 20. 7.* p. 40.

To which I Answer, His Saying it is a *Taking of the Name of the Lord in Vain*, &c. is not a Proving it to be so. And therefore it were enough for the present, if I only denied his Assertion, and put him, if he can, to Prove it.

But because I would not have the *Reader* misled by a Precarious and Confident Assertion, I shall offer this one plain Argument to his Consideration; If a
Taking

Taking of the Name of the Lord in Vain, *Exod.* 20. 7. is *Perjury* or *Forswearing*, then the *Present Affirmation* is not a Taking of the Name of the Lord in Vain; but a Taking of the Name of the Lord in Vain, *Exod.* 20. 7. is *Perjury* or *Forswearing*, therefore the *Present Affirmation* is not a Taking of the Name of the Lord in Vain.

The Sequel of the *Major* is Evident, because the *Present Affirmation* is not *Perjury* or *Forswearing*.

The *Minor*, if denied, is proved by the Words of Christ, Expounding *Exod.* 20. 7. *Thou shalt not, saith he, Forswear thy self, Mat.* 5. 33.

To Take or Lift up the Name of the Lord, is an Hebrew Phrase for, To Swear; and to Take or Lift it up in Vain, is in that Language, To Forswear. So that, whether we consider our Saviour's Interpretation of *Exod.* 20. 7. or the Signification of the Words in the Hebrew, the Primary Intention of the Phrase, To Take the Name of the Lord in Vain, is to Forswear. I say the Primary Intention of the Phrase; for tho' all Idle, Wanton, or Irreverent using the Name of the Lord, is *Secondarily*, or by way of *Reduction*, forbidden in *Exod.* 20. 7. yet the Primary Intention of that Command is to Prohibit *Forswearing*. And of the same Judgment were the Authors of the *Treatise of Oaths*, who quoting the Words of Christ, "It was said of old, Thou shalt not Forswear thy self; but I say, Swear not at all. 'Tis true, it is not particularized what Oaths they were to keep of Old; but in general Terms, that they were not to Forswear themselves, p. 21.

In opposition to this, the *Essayer*, p. 41. urgeth the Words in the said *Treatise*, p. 13. "For us to Swear, were to Take his Holy Name in Vain.

I grant it to be so, since Christ hath forbidden all Swearing; but before his Prohibition, it was not Swearing by the Name of the Lord, in Truth, Judgment and Righteousness, but *Forswearing*, that was a Taking of his Name in Vain. For such Swearing

was expressly commanded by him, *Deut. 6. 13. 10. 20. Jer. 4. 2.*

Effayer, "The Name of God is Divine, and not to be mentioned but in a Divine Sense, more or less, see p. 35.

Answ. 'Tis the Reverent Using of the Name of God that I plead for; and how can that be done but in a Divine Sense, &c?

Effayer, "Whatever peculiar Properties of an Oath may be supposed to be absent in such Forms of Speech, as the *Present Affirmation*, yet it is very apparent, it is used as an Expedient to Extort the Truth, and that the Name of God is used therein, which is needless, since the Truth may as well be spoken without it, p. 39.

Answ. If the Peculiar Properties of an Oath may be supposed to be absent in the *Present Affirmation*, then it may, by his Concession, be supposed to be no Oath; and that very reasonably too, because Peculiar Properties, as they flow from the Essence of a Thing, so it cannot Exist without them; for take away that which is Essential, as Peculiar Properties are, and it ceases to be what it was. Neither is it very apparent, (tho' he says so) that the *Present Affirmation* is used as an Expedient to Extort the Truth. He argues from a Quotation out of the *Treatise of Oaths*, but perverts the Design of the Authors; for they speak of such Extortings as are by Oaths, and not by the *Present Affirmation*, "Men of Virtue, say they, "will speak Truth without Extortings; for Oaths are a sort of Racks to the Mind, and altogether useless, where Integrity sways, p. 12.

But saith the *Effayer*, "The Name of God is used therein, [*viz. in the Present Affirmation*] which is needless, since the Truth may as well be spoken without it.

Answ. The Truth cannot as well be spoken without the Name of God, as with it. For without the Name or Power of God Assisting and Inabling of us,

it is impossible. And therefore 'tis not *needless*, but *needful* to use it Reverently in our Testifying or Declaring the Truth.

To say, *The Truth may as well be spoken without the Name or Power of God*, is Rank Pelagianism, and sets up *Man's Power* as sufficient of it self. Christ said, *Without me ye can do nothing*, John 15. 5. And the Apostle said, *Our sufficiency is of God*, 2 Cor. 3. 5. But the *Essayer's* Words import, that we can Speak Truth without Christ, and have a Sufficiency, as of our selves, and without God to do it.

Thus, while the *Essayer* strives against the *Present Affirmation*, which confesses to the *Power and Presence of God*, he not only advanceth, but equalizeth the *Power of Man* to it; for what doth he less when he says, *The Truth may as well be spoken without it?* that is, without the *Name or Power of God*, which is downright Pelagianism.

And as to his Insinuating, that the *Present Affirmation* is more than *Tea, Yea, and Nay, Nay, and cometh of Evil*; the *Treatise of Oaths*, a Book he makes so much use of, and endeavours to build his False Hypothesis upon, is directly against him; "Nor is there any thing more than *Tea and Nay*,
"besides *Perjury*, which can be intended, but an
"Oath; and therefore that was intended, [*viz.*
Mat. 5. 37.] *Treatise*, &c. p. 23. To which I shall
add what *W. Penn* saith in Answer to the *Athenians*,
"But you think, saith he, you pinch us up, by urg-
"ing the Text upon us Literally, which alas, is
"your mistake; for so that we do not *Swear*, we
"answer that Precept, tho' by other Words than
"Tea and Nay. *The New Athenians no Noble Bercans*,
p. 2. Col. 2.

And that the *Present Affirmation* is no Oath or Swearing, is abundantly proved in the Foregoing Answer.

Obj. 3. Again, It hath been objected against the *Present Affirmation*, That it is a Limited Form to be repeated Verbatim after a Clerk, &c.

Ans.

Ans. This Objection is answered in part already, see *Ans.* to *Obj.* 1. p. 164. wherein 'tis proved, that the *Present Affirmation* is a *Form of Sound Words*, and therefore may lawfully be used; and as to Repeating of it after a Clerk, &c. the Act of the Clerk being but a Civil Act, I see no Just Reason to Refuse or Scruple the Repetition of it after him.

Obj. 4. The Words, *The Witness of the Truth*, &c. are objected against by some, who make no Hesitation at *Declaring in the Presence of God*.

Ans. They that make this Objection may be said indeed to be Scrupulous; but if it be considered, that we can do nothing *in the Presence of God*, whereof he is not *Witness* also, their Scruple may easily be removed. Besides, we have the Example of the *Apostle Paul*, and Multitudes of our *Antient Friends*, to Justifie the Lawfulness of Reverent Using that Form of Expression.

Obj. 5. It is likewise objected, *That tho' the Present Affirmation may be used when we have a Motion from the Spirit of Truth, yet we may not use it when we feel no such Motion*.

Ans. Take for an Answer to this Objection, what *W. Penn* says upon a like Occasion. The Question being thus put by him, "But we must have a Motion or Command from the Spirit of Truth for all things that we do? He Answers it in these Words following, "That may be according to the Truth, which may not be by the Immediate Motion or Command of the Truth; for that is according to the Truth, that is not against the Mind of the Truth, either particularly or generally Express'd. The Truth commands me to do all to the Praise and Glory of God; but not that I should Wait for a Motion to do every Particular Thing. For Example: The Variety of Actions in Trading, Commerce and Husbandry, the Variety of Flesh, Fish and Fowl for Food, with more of the same Nature, in all which there is a Choice

“ Choice and Liberty, but still according to the
 “ Truth, and within the Holy Bounds and Limits
 “ of it.

“ *Quest.* Then it seems there are some things left
 “ to our Freedom.

“ *Answ.* Yes; but it must still be according to
 “ the Mind of God’s Truth: There are things en-
 “ joyed, such as relate to *our Duty towards God,*
 “ to *our Superiours,* to the Household of Faith, and
 “ to all Men and Creatures, these are *Indispensable.*
 “ There are also things, that may be done or left
 “ undone, which may be called *Indifferent*; — yet,
 “ even in these Cases, I ought to act according to
 “ the Truth, in the Temperance and Wisdom of it,
W. Penn’s Brief Examination and State of Liberty Spi-
ritual, &c. p. 2.

“ *Quest.* But must I conform to things, whether I
 “ can receive them or no? Ought I not to be left
 “ to the Grace and Spirit of God in my own Heart?

“ *Answ.* To the first Part of the Question, *Nay*;
 “ to the last, *Yea.* But now let us consider, what
 “ is the Reason thou can’st not receive them? Is
 “ the Fault in the Things themselves? Are they
 “ Inconsistent with Truth? Or will not the Truth
 “ Own or Assent unto them? Or is the Fault in
 “ thee? That is to say, Is it thy *Weakness* or *Care-*
 “ *lessness*? If thy *Weakness*, it is to be Born with,
 “ and to be Informed; if thy *Carelessness*, thou
 “ oughtest to be Admonished; for it is a Danger-
 “ ous Principle, and Pernicious to True Religion;
 “ and, which is worse, it is the *Root of Ranterism*
 “ to Assert, *That nothing is a Duty incumbent upon*
 “ *thee, but what thou art perswaded is thy Duty:* For
 “ the Seared Conscience pleads his Liberty against
 “ all Duty, the Dark Conscience is here Uncon-
 “ demned; unless this Distinction be allow’d of,
 “ That there may be an Ignorance or Insensibility,
 “ from *Inability* or *Incapacity,* or a *Dark Education*;
 “ and

"and an Ignorance and Insensibility, from Careles-
 "less, Disobedience, Prejudice, &c. So that tho' thou
 "art not to Conform to a thing Ignorantly, yet
 "thou art seriously to consider, why thou art Igno-
 "rant, and what the Cause of such Ignorance may
 "be; certainly it can't be in God, nor in his Gift to
 "thee; it must then needs be in thy self, who hast
 "not yet received a Sense for or against the Mat-
 "ter, about which thou art in doubt.

"To the second part of the Question, *Ought I not*
 "to be left to the Grace of God in my own Heart?

"Answ. That is of all things most desirable, since
 "they are well left, that are left there; for there
 "is no Fear of Want of Unity, where all are left
 "with the One Spirit of Truth; they must be of
 "One Mind, they can't be otherwise. So that to
 "plead this against Unity, is to abuse the very
 "Plea, and to commit the greatest Contradiction
 "to that very Doctrine of Scripture, viz. That all
 "should be guided by the Grace and Spirit of God in
 "themselves; for the End of that Doctrine is Cer-
 "tainty. They shall all know me from the least to the
 "greatest. And I will give them one Heart, and one
 "Way, that they may Fear me for ever, for the good
 "of them, and of their Children after them, Jer. 32. 39.
 "And I will give them one Heart, and I will put a new
 "Spirit within you; and I will take the Stony Heart out
 "of their Flesh, and will give them a Heart of Flesh,
 "Ezek. 11. 19. And the Multitude of them that be-
 "lieved were of one Heart, and of one Soul, Acts 4. 32.
 "Is not this Unity too? I will restore unto you a pure
 "Language, they shall be of one Heart, and of one Mind,
 "and great shall be their Peace. Therefore I must say
 "to thee, Friend, what if thou wilt not be left
 "with the Grace and Spirit of God in thy self, nor
 "Wait for its Mind, nor be Watchful to its Reve-
 "lations, nor Humble and Quiet till thou hast re-
 "ceived such necessary Manifestations, but pleadest
 "against the Counsel of the Spirit of the Lord in
 "other

" other Faithful Persons, under Pretence of being left
 " to his Spirit in thy self; by which means thou
 " opposest the Spirit to the Spirit, and pleadest for
 " Difunity, under the Name of Liberty, *Ibid.* p. 3, 4.
 " Again, " It is my Earnest Desire, that all that
 " have any Knowledge of the Lord, would have a
 " tender Care how they use that Plea against their
 " Faithful Brethren, that God put into their Mouths
 " against the Persecuting Priests and Hirelings of the
 " World, namely, *I must mind the Spirit of God in my*
 " *self*; for tho' it be a great Truth, that all are to
 " be thereunto left, yet it is as True, that he whose
 " Soul is left with the Spirit of Truth in himself,
 " Differs not from his Brethren that are in the same
 " Spirit; and as True it is, that those who Err from
 " the Spirit of Truth, may Plead, *Being left to the*
 " *Spirit of Truth in themselves*, against the Motion
 " and Command of the Spirit through another, when it
 " pleaseth not his or her High Mind and Perverse
 " Will; for a Saying may be True or False, accord-
 " ing to the Subject-matters it is spoken upon, or
 " applied to: We own the Assertion, we deny the
 " Application: There lies the Snare. 'Tis true, the
 " People of God ought to be left to the Guidings of
 " the Spirit of God in themselves: But for this to
 " be so Applied, as to Disregard the Teachings or
 " Writings of Christ's Enlightned Servants, because by
 " them Applied properly to the Preaching or Wri-
 " ting of False Prophets and Seducers, will by no
 " means follow: I say, the Doctrine is True, but not
 " Exclusively of all External Counsel or Direction; there-
 " fore False in Application, where Men are allowed to
 " have had the Fear of God, and the Mind of his Spirit,
 " and are not Proved to have acted in their own
 " Wills and Wisdom, and without the Guidance of
 " the Spirit of God, about the things of his Church
 " and Kingdom, *Ibid.* p. 9.
 " And since your Testimony is against Impositions,
 " and for leaving every one to the Measure of the

“ Grace which God hath given him, not only, No

* According to the *Modern Dialect* of some, *I am a Better Friend than any of you.* “ *Man hath Power to Reprove or Judge me, but I may be * as Good a Friend as any of you, according to my Measure.*

|| Conscience against Conscience, Inward Sense against Inward Sense, and the Perverse Judgment of Fallible Man opposed to the Infallible Doctrine of Christ. “ And now, here is || *Measure set against Measure, which is Confusion it self, — Babel indeed. This is that very Rock both Professors and Profane would long since have run us upon; — which indeed grieves*

“ the Spirit of God. — And from the deep Sense that “ I have of the Working of the Enemy of Zion’s “ Peace, to Rend and Divide the Heritage of God, “ who, under the Pretence of Crying down Man’s “ Forms and Prescriptions, is Crying down the Hea- “ venly Man Christ Jesus, his Blessed Order and Govern- “ ment, which he hath brought forth by his own Re- “ velation and Power, through his Faithful Witnesses; “ this I further Testifie, That the Enemy, by these “ Fair Pretences, strikes at the Godly Care and Tra- “ vail that dwells upon the Spirits of many Faithful “ Brethren, that all things might be preserved Sweet, “ Comely, Virtuous, and of Good Report in the “ Church of God, *Ibid.* p. 11, 12. Thus far our Ancient and Judicious Friend, *William Penn.*

Obj. 6. It is also objected, That the Present Affirmation is a Form, which cannot be Justified by the Sayings or Testimonies of our Ancient Friends. For tho’ they did Attest the Name of God in Terrene Affairs; yet they were not willing to have any Particular Form Imposed upon them, but to use such a Form as they had a Motion to from the Spirit of God in themselves.

Ans. 1. By this the Present Affirmation is so far Justified, as to be Clear of the Odious Insinuation of its being an Oath, tho’ the Essayer hath Insinuated it in several Places of his Essay, as is shewn *Sect. I. p. 7, 8.* For he doth not charge our Ancient Friends with Swearing,

Swearing, tho' they were free to use the Name of God in *Terrene Affairs*, as in the Cases of *Allegiance*, and of *Meum* and *Tuum*, see *Essay*, p. 49, to 66. and was the same for Substance with the *Present Affirmation*, but Excuseth them in the Use thereof, being Immediately Moved thereto, by the Holy Ghost, as he Excuseth the Apostle's Attesting the Name of God, saying, Let it have been done in what Form soever, it cannot be deemed an Oath, Ibid. p. 46. From whence it follows, That if the *Essayer's* Notion were True, as it is undoubtedly False, A Man having an Immediate Motion by the Holy Ghost to take the Common National Oath, or any other Form whatsoever, and doth accordingly take it, that Man cannot be said to Swear. For an *Immediate Motion*, according to the *Essayer*, can make an Oath in the most Solemn Form to be no Oath at all.

—Credat Judæus Apella. *Hor. l. 1. §. 5. v. 100.*
By any means I can't believe it true,
But leave it to the Circumcised Jew.

Answ. 2. Their not being willing to have any Particular Form Imposed upon them, but to use such a Form as they had a Motion to from the Spirit of the Lord in themselves, implies, they were not against all Forms whatsoever: And that is sufficient to Justifie me, and all other Friends, in the Use of the *Present Affirmation*, who are sensible of a Divine Motion to, and in the Taking of it.

Answ. 3. The *Essayer* distinguishing between *Extraordinary* and *Ordinary Occasions*, and saying, "It is one thing what any Person may, upon some *Extraordinary* Occasion, find a Disposition or Liberty to use, and another thing to be Bound to do it at all Times and Occasions, *Essay*, p. 67. leaves it to the Person to Judge, what Occasion is *Extraordinary*, and what is not. And if he is to be Judge, that may appear to him to be an *Extraordinary* Occasion, which by another is accounted *Ordinary*, and so *vice versâ*. And therefore, unless the *Essayer* can

give us some certain *Criterion* or *Rule*, which might Infallibly direct us in this Case, our Sentiments are likely to remain Undetermined about *Extraordinary* and *Ordinary Occasions*, and his Distinction unanswerable to the End he designs it.

Answ. 4. Nor will his Distinction between *Religious* and *Terrene* Matters do him any Service in this Case; for an Oath is an Oath, whether the Matter be *Religious* or *Terrene*; as is already demonstrated in this *Treatise*.

And here I should close this *Eighth Section*, and with it the *whole Work* it self; but that the *Essayer* hath done that worthy Man of God, *George Fox*, such an Apparent Injury in a Particular Instance, that Justice to his Memory, and Love to the Reader, necessarily require an Absterfion of the Abuse.

He represents *George Fox*, who, being "moved of the Lord, did in the Year 1654. Declare in the Presence of the Lord God, that he denied the Use of a Carnal Weapon, &c. Essay, p. 52. as one, who, tho' "he suffered several Years Imprisonment [at Lancaster]," for refusing to take the Oath of Allegiance, &c. Ibid. p. 54. yet chose rather to lie in Prison, than to Attest the Presence of God, because he did not feel the Lord immediately moving or stirring him thereunto, see Ibid. p. 53. Thereby insinuating, that G. F. might have been set at Liberty, if when he refused the Oath of Allegiance, he had offered an Attestation of the Presence of God. When 'tis plain from his Journal, p. 277, &c. that he was kept in Prison at Lancaster and Scarborough-Castle from 1663. till the First Day of the Seventh Month, 1666. Only for Refusing the Oath of Allegiance, &c.

'Tis therefore a Palpable Injury done to G. F. and a great Imposition upon the Reader, to insinuate, that G. F. might have been Discharged from his Imprisonment, if he could have Attested the Presence of God. And further to misguide the Reader, by making G. F. a Party to the *Essayer's New Discovery*, he stops

stops at this *Lancaster-Relation*, and makes such Remarks upon it, as he thought suited best with his mistaken Hypothesis: That some Easie and Credulous, tho' otherwise Well-meaning Persons might, as I have been well Inform'd one actually did, draw this Untrue Inference from the *Essayer's* Fallacious Account, "That G. F. did once *Declare in, or Attest the Presence of God*, as in the Year 1654. but he "could not do it afterwards.

Whereas he afterwards declared he could do it, as appears from his *Journal*, in the Year 1674. See p. 399. when being brought before the Judges of the King's Bench, G. F. tendred them a Paper, in which was contained, *what he could say instead of the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy*, as followeth, "This I do in the Truth, and in the Presence of God declare, &c. --- Which he there expressly calls his *Yea or Nay*.

But so Disingenuous and Injurious is the *Essayer*, as to drop this Remarkable Passage, and represent G. F. as a *Non-Affirmer*, as well as a *Non-Juror*.

But if the *Essayer* had been Just to his own Rule, p. 49. where he says, "That no Author's Judgment [should] "be determined (in any Particular Point of "Doctrine) from Transient Passages; but rather "Collected from the General Drift and Tendency "of such of his Writings, where he Treats (*ex* "professo) of that very Subject:" How could he have dealt so Unfairly by G. F. as he hath done? For doth not G. F. Treat *Ex Professo*, or Professedly, of this very Subject, *namely*, of the Lawfulness of *Declaring in the Presence of God*, instead of Taking the *Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy*? *Journal*, p. 399. Certainly he doth: But if the *Essayer* hath the Confidence to deny so plain a Matter of Fact, or account G. F.'s Words Casual Expressions, let fall by Chance, p. 64. *Transient Passages*, p. 49. *Less guarded*, p. 53. Or Phrases of Speech inconsistent with the Gospel-Testimony, see p. 93. What may he not Deny, or speak Diminutively of?

At

At Worcester Assizes 1674. when the Judge asked G. Fox to take the Oaths, "I told him (saith G. F.) "I could not take any Oath for Conscience-sake; and "I did believe, he and they all knew in their Con-
 sciences, that it was for Conscience-sake, I could not
 "Swear at all: But, saith he, I did Declare amongst
 "them what I could say, &c. Journal, p. 396. And
 at Worcester Quarter-Sessions, he told the Chair-Man,
 --- Street, --- "why he could not take them (seeing
 "Christ hath Forbidden all Swearing) and what I
 "could Say or Sign in lieu thereof, as I had done
 "before. --- And before the Jury gave in their Ver-
 "dict, I spake to them, and told them, That it was
 "for Christ's sake, and in Obedience to his and his
 "Apostle's Command, that I could not Swear: And
 "therefore, said I, take heed what you do; for be-
 "fore his Judgment-Seat ye shall all be brought. The
 "Judge said, This is Canting (a base Word!) I said,
 "If to Confess Christ, our Lord and Saviour, and to
 "Obey his Command, be called Canting by a Judge of
 "a Court, it is to little purpose for me to say more
 "among you: Yet ye shall see that I am a Christian,
 "and shall shew forth Christianity, and my Innocency
 "shall be manifest, Ibid. p. 398.

Again, "After I had got a Copy of the Indictment
 "against me, I went up to London, --- I was brought
 "--- by Habeas Corpus before them [viz. the Judges
 of the King's Bench] "and I tendred them a Paper, in
 "which was contained, what I could say instead of
 "the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, as followeth,
 "This I do in the Truth, and in the Presence of God
 "declare, &c. Ibid. p. 399.

And afterwards, in the same Year, (1674.) at
 Worcester-Sessions, "The Judge said, The Oath hath
 "been tendred to you several Times; and we will have
 "some Satisfaction from you concerning the Oath. I of-
 "fer'd them, saith G. F. the same Declaration instead
 "of the Oath, which I had offer'd to the Judges above;
 "but it would not be accepted, Ibid. p. 400.

From all which it appears, beyond Contradiction, that the *Paper or Declaration* which *G. Fox* tendred at the *King's Bench*, and at *Worcesters*, was not a *Casual thing*, let fall by *Chance*, or a *Transient Passage*, or *Less guarded* than it should have been, or *Inconsistent with the Gospel-Testimony*; but was *Drawn up and Tendred upon Mature Deliberation*, as his *fixed Judgment*, agreeable to the *Command of Christ* and the *Apostle James*, and his *Yea or Nay*, as he was a *Christian*.

What *G. F.* tendred, was not a *Sudden*, or *meer Occasional Act*, but he did it *Ex Professo*, *Professedly* and *Deliberately*, as his *Offers aforesaid* plainly and fully manifest. And as he was moved of the *Lord* in the Year 1654. to *Declare in the Presence of the Lord God*, that he *denied the Wearing or Drawing of a Carnal Sword*, &c. *Ibid.* p. 137. So dareth the *Essayer* say, that *G. F.* was not moved of the *Lord* in the Year 1674. to *Declare in the Presence of God*, that *King Charles the Second* was *Lawful King*? &c.

I leave it now to every *Sober, Solid, and Unprejudiced Reader* to Judge, whether *G. F.* did not Treat, *Ex Professo*, in the *Paper aforesaid*, and in other Places, where he either offer'd to *Declare in the Presence of God*, or referred to the *same Declaration*? And whether we are not to Collect his Judgment from such a *Professed Treating* of the Subject of *Declaring in the Presence of God*, rather than from the Inferences which the *Essayer* draws from a Passage, where *G. F.* says nothing about it; but, because there is not one *Word of Attesting the Presence of God*, *Essay*, p. 53. and it doth not appear that he offered any such *Affirmation*, p. 54. therefore the *Essayer*, as became such a *Disputant*, hath been, as he there confesses, the more *Particular in it*? And whether the *Essayer* hath not *Egregiously Abused* both *G. F.* and the *Reader*, in Representing *G. F.* as choosing rather to *Lie in Prison*, than to *Arrest the Presence of God*?

To conclude ; *Untruths* are but for a Time, but *Truth* abides for ever ; and whether the *Effayer* will or no, It shall and will Conquer. And I desire, that he will not take me for his Enemy, because I have told him the Truth. I have nothing but Love and Good-will to him, and to all that Dissent from me in the Present Controversie ; and my Earnest Supplication to the Lord is for him and them, that they may lay down all Prepossessions of Judgment, all Stiffness of Mistaken Opinion, and not slight that *Friendly Assistance*, which in great Love and Faithfulness is Humbly Offered to them for their Information, *Hæc est Veritas quam Christus ipse docuit, Apostoli tradiderunt, & Amici Veteres & Fideles Testimoniis corroboraverunt, Præque Unanimes custodiverunt* : This is a Truth which Christ himself hath Taught, his Apostles have Delivered, and our Ancient Faithful Friends have Confirmed by their Testimonies, and Unanimously kept in the Practice of.
